consideration, subject to the will of the Senate.

Very shortly, Mr. President, we shall again be engaged in a national political campaign. Failure to act on legislative proposals in this field can but be interpreted by the public as disinterest on the part of the Senate in any bona fide effort to improve the situation. I urge, Mr. President, that there be no further delay in the consideration of legislation vital to the preservation of our democratic representative form of government.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have addressed myself to the question of statehood for Alaska, and have given at some length my reasons for feeling that the admission of Alaska to the Union is vital to the interests of the country.

These are urgent hours for the cause of Alaskan statehood, and the fate of statehood for Alaska now hangs in the balance.

The House of Representatives is now considering a bill under an extraordinary procedure. Owing to that fact, and to the fact that the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives has taken a position which I regard as adverse to the bill and as different from that officially taken by the Republican Party and publicly taken by the President of the United States in the formal endorsement he has given to the statehood cause, I had delivered to the President this afternoon a letter which I shall read into the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

MAY 21, 1958.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

MR. PRESIDENT: Statehood for Alaska is a part of the platform of the Republican Party as it is of the Democratic Party. Secretary of Interior Fred A. Seaton, a member of your official family, has effectively and forthrightly worked for statehood legislation and has reflected great credit upon your administration in these efforts.

On April 12, 1957, I wrote you about statehood, stating my fear that "unless you actively undertake to support your endorsement with the full potential of your high office" statehood would fail.

A bill to admit Alaska to the Union is now the pending business of the House of Representatives. I am disturbed to note that the leadership of your party in that body has not supported your position with respect to taking up this bill, and I fear now, as I feared in April 1957, that your determined and persistent support is requisite for success of this struggle.

I hope that the American citizens in Alaska, so long denied statehood, may receive this support now. Next week may be too late.

Respectfully,

FRANK CHURCH.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 21, 1958, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 728. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds;

S. 847. An act to amend the act of June 5, 1944, relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hungry Horse Dam, Mont.;

S. 2557. An act to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota in order to extend the time for such negotiation;

S. 2813. An act to provide for certain credits to the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District in consideration of the transfer to the Government of property in Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 3087. An act to provide for the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; and

S. 3371. An act to amend the act of August 25, 1916, to increase the period for which concessionaire leases may be granted under that act from 20 years to 30 years.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 21, 1958:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Lawrence L. Seal	Dale V. Bedenkop
Larry H. Clark	Joel P. Porcher
Allen J. Lewis	Richard G. Hajec
Vastine C. Ahlrich	William A. Hughes
G. Thomas Susi	Joseph M. Rodgers
James K. Richards	James R. Schwartz
Jordan S. Baker	Verle B. Miller
Richard H. Garnett, Jr.	

To be ensigns

Richard E. Alderman	Ronald L. Newsom
James B. Allen	Harvey A. Peterson
Karl R. Anderson	Edward L. Talbot
Lawrence S. Brown	James A. Ten Eyck
Charles A. Burroughs	Charles K. Townsend
David Cummings	Richard L. Turnbull
Glenn DeGroot	Phillip W. Ward
Wesley V. Hull	J. Dunston Wingfield, Jr.
Frederick A. Ismond	
Arthur C. Korn	David I. Wolsk

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 21, 1958:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Ira A. Dixon, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1962.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 21, 1958:

POSTMASTER

Doris Opal Garner to be postmaster at Van Horn, in the State of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 8: 31: *If God be for us, who can be against us?*

Eternal God, our Father, Thou art the wise Holy One, the supreme source and answer to our deepest longings and loftiest aspirations.

We humbly acknowledge that the forces of evil, which are arrayed against us, are terrible but not too terrible for Thy divine righteousness and power.

Thou alone can'st lift our minds and hearts out of the darkest fears and lead us into the light and liberty of Thy presence and peace.

Inspire us with a greater faith in the coming of the golden age when weary and heavy laden humanity shall find their rest in Thee.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KIRWAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 10746) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Buckley	Fenton	Powell
Burdick	Granahan	Radwan
Carnahan	Gregory	Rivers
Christopher	Gross	Scott, N. C.
Clark	Hays, Ark.	Scott, Pa.
Colmer	Henderson	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Hillings	Shuford
Dent	James	Sieminski
Dies	Jenkins	Spence
Dowdy	Kearney	Steed
Durham	Knutson	Trimble
Eberharter	Lennon	Watts
Engle	Morris	Willis
Fascell	Nimtz	Wilson, Calif.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADMISSION OF ALASKA INTO THE UNION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and pursuant to rule

XI, clause 20, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 days, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] to limit general debate on the bill?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a point of order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the unanimous consent request as to the division of the time?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit a point of order at this time that the bill is not privileged and, therefore, the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union is not in order at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if this bill, H. R. 7999, is privileged at all, it is privileged under clause 20 of rule XI, authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to bring in a bill for admission of a new State. It must conform in every respect to the rule, or its privilege is destroyed.

But, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains matter that is not privileged and under the very familiar rule with which all of us are thoroughly cognizant, the presence of unprivileged matter in a bill destroys the privilege of the bill. This bill carries provisions which are not privileged and, therefore, the entire bill is unprivileged and the committee has no authority to bring it to the floor at this time or in this manner.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the bill, although reported out by a legislative committee, carries appropriations.

Lines 9 to 17 provide for payment of moneys, which under title 16, United States Code, section 631 (e), would otherwise be covered into the Public Treasury. Lines 3 to 8 of page 8 of the bill provide for payment to "said State" of certain proceeds which otherwise, under title 48, United States Code, section 306, would go into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. Section 28 (a) of the bill requires the payment to the Treasury of Alaska of funds which otherwise would be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, title 48, United States Code, section 439. And on the last page of the bill lines 7 to 11 require payment of Federal funds to the State of Alaska.

I am certain that no one on this floor will deny that these provisions are wholly without privilege and under the rules of the House have no place in any legislative bill. One unprivileged matter in a privileged bill destroys the privilege of the entire bill. Any one of these unprivileged provisions destroys any privilege the bill might otherwise possess. That is self-evident. This is clearly appropriating language and is, therefore, not in order on a legislative bill.

It will be argued, Mr. Speaker, possibly in the citation which has just been laid before the Speaker that under the rule giving privilege to certain bills reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, nonprivileged matters included as necessary to the accomplishment of the purpose for which privilege is given are in order. But note, Mr. Speaker, the significant word "necessary." Any such nonprivileged material, in order to qualify under this decision, must be necessary—must be necessary to the accomplishment of the purpose of the bill.

Conversely, under the same rule, Mr. Speaker, matters which are not privileged and which are not necessary to the accomplishment of the purpose destroy the privilege of the bill. And again I emphasize the word "necessary."

Are any of these unprivileged provisions—or all of them—necessary? Are they necessary to the act of admission? Are they essentially accessory? Are all of them—or any one of them—necessary? Are they necessary in order to confer statehood under this bill?

Mr. Speaker no one can successfully contend that any of them are necessary in order to accomplish the purpose of the bill.

Therefore, it follows that being unprivileged—which no one will deny—and not being necessary to accomplish the act—which no one will affirm—they destroy the privilege of this bill and it cannot be brought to the floor by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the rule cited by the gentleman here this afternoon.

Page after page in this bill can be cited in which there are unprivileged matters and which cannot be admitted under the theory that they are incident to the accomplishment of the purpose; that they are accessory to the purpose which the bill purports to accomplish.

I hope I may have the attention of the Speaker who has looked all along as if he had made up his mind and was not going to change it. I trust he will give attention with an open mind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you: Who is there who will say here this afternoon that the making of all these appropriations and the many other unprivileged provisions embodied in this reprehensible bill are necessary—necessary, Mr. Speaker—to the purpose of conferring statehood as provided by this bill?

There are many other nonprivileged provisions of the bill that might be cited—although they are incident—which are not necessary to the accomplishment of the objective from which the bill would otherwise derive its privilege; and being unprivileged the rule and the precedents conversely make this bill unprivileged.

This is an iniquitous bill. It is loaded with unprivileged matter—matter wholly unnecessary to the accomplishment of the act of conferring statehood. And it seeks to give away under guise of a privileged bill such vast amounts of property as have never been given away in the history of the admission of any State to the Union. And for that reason, because they are unprivileged and because they are not necessary to accomplishment of the privileged purposes of the bill, this whole bill is unprivileged and this committee has no right to report it to the House at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] is recognized.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, speaking in opposition to the position taken by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is known for his great talent in such matters as this, I wish to state first that this bill is brought up at this time under rule XI, clause 20, of the Rules of the House of Representatives. This particular area is of jurisdiction now given to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and not to the Committee on Public Lands. It is under that rule that we proceed today.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has made two objections to the bringing up of the bill at this time. One is that this is not an admission bill, and the second is that it contains unprivileged matters.

Mr. Speaker, the objection that the bill is not an admission bill and, therefore, could not qualify under the rule I have cited is not tenable. H. R. 7999 is the last step in the Congressional process. No further action by the House will be required. All that is required is an election by which the qualified voters of Alaska agree to accept the boundaries of the State as fixed in H. R. 7999, and consent to the various reservations of rights and powers as set out in the bill. If, as expected, the election is in favor of this proposition, the President will so proclaim.

The pattern set out in the bill in this respect is very similar to that which has been employed in other admission cases. The provision of rule XI, with which we are here concerned, was first adopted in 1890.

The best index that we have to its meaning and proper construction is what the Congress was familiar with at the time of its first adoption.

Twenty-nine States were admitted to the Union after its formation and before 1890. Nine of these were in the period 1860 to 1889. Of these 9 only 1, Kansas in 1861, was a simple, complete, outright admission. In all other eight cases, West Virginia, Nebraska, Nevada, Colorado, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, Congressional action was completed in the same way as provided in H. R. 7999 for Alaska, but it was left to the President to proclaim that the conditions attached to the admission had been met by the local electorate or the local legislature.

These nine cases were those with which the Members of the 51st Congress were most familiar when they voted on the adoption of the rule with which we are now concerned. It makes little sense to say that they adopted a rule which did not cover 8 of the 9 admissions that had occurred in the immediately preceding years. It makes no sense to say that the 51st Congress regarded the bills

which laid the groundwork for admitting these States as not being admission bills.

This is the background of rule XI, clause 20. We would be doing ourselves and our predecessors an injustice to urge that H. R. 7999 does not come within the privilege granted by it.

In answer to the gentleman's second objection, an examination of the bill will dispel that it contains so-called unprivileged matter which would permit a point of order to be upheld.

Moreover, I call attention to section 4637 in volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents where it is made clear that:

> The rule giving privilege to reports from the Committee on Public Lands (a predecessor of the present Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) permits the including of matters necessary to accomplishment of the purposes for which privilege is given.

I call attention also to Mr. Speaker Reed's observation in dealing with another bill——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I hope the gentleman will emphasize the word "necessary"——

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado has not yielded yet.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call attention also Mr. Speaker Reed's observation dealing with another bill reported from the same committee—volume IV, section 4638—that the provision giving privilege to its reports "has always had a liberal construction."

And I point out that our committee is given the same latitude in reporting "bills for the admission of new States" that the Committee on Ways and Means is given with respect to "bills raising revenue."

Mr. Speaker Longworth said with respect to the latter—volume VIII, section 2284:

> If a major feature of a bill reported from the Ways and Means Committee relates to revenue the bill is privileged, and matters accompanying the bill not strictly raising revenue but incidental to its main purpose do not destroy this privilege.

The reason for all this is obvious. The privilege is not to be whittled away by a niggardly approach to it. It has been granted for a purpose and it must be read with that purpose in mind. The purpose is to permit consideration of matters of transcendent importance to be expedited, to prevent them from being bottled up behind matters of less consequence, and to assure that they are not defeated through sheer inability to move the machinery which is an inescapable part of the legislative process for run-of-the-mine bills.

Let us look at H. R. 7999 in the light of the pronouncements I quoted before, in the light of the usual requirements of germaneness and relevancy, and in the light of the standard contents of bills for the admission of new States to the Union.

To put the matter briefly, H. R. 7999 covers three subjects:

First. Those describing the territorial boundaries of the new State; providing that its constitution shall always be republican in form and consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence; and setting out the procedural steps to be followed before the President proclaims its admission to the Union.

Second. Those providing, so to speak, the new State's dowry, and requiring it to disclaim any right, title or interest in any Federal property which is not given to it.

And may I call the Speaker's attention to the fact that the State of Wyoming was admitted under the same privileged rule, although the bill admitting the Territory of Wyoming to statehood provided means of appropriation and provided that 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands should go to the State. The Wyoming bill appropriated $30,000 to defray the cost of a State constitutional convention.

In other words, the question of appropriation may be a question of degree, but it does not destroy the privileged right that the bill has.

Third. Those that will provide for a smooth transition from the status of Territory to that of State, namely, (a) the continued effectiveness of already enacted laws until they are displaced by other legislation; (b) the nonabatement of pending litigation and causes of action; (c) the continuation in office of officials until new ones are chosen and the holding of the first election of the new State's Congressional delegation; (d) the adjustment of certain Federal statutes to the new status of Alaska—for example, the statutes dealing with the judicial system, the Federal Reserve System, and immigration and nationality matters.

Some of these may differ in degree, but they do not differ in kind from the many earlier bills for the admission of States. All of these provisions, I contend, are completely germane to the subject of Alaska as a State.

Mr. Speaker, there are other data and precedents which I might offer for the purpose of showing that many of the various provisions in former bills are included in this bill; that there are, in fact, some new provisions in this bill, but it is simply because of the fact that Alaska is now asking for statehood at a later time when these provisions are germane to any bill proposing statehood.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard for a moment on this.

Mr. Speaker, it does not appear that in any of those cases that were cited by the gentleman from Colorado this question that he has raised with reference to the things that might be included was raised or ruled on in a privileged bill of this character.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains, as the gentleman from Missouri has so ably said, numbers of appropriations. For instance, on page 7, commencing on line 8, there is a direction annually to turn over to the State "70 percent of the net proceeds, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, derived during such fiscal year from all sales of sealskins or sea otter skins * * *." The same sort of thing applies to every bit of that operation. The bill itself contains all sorts of matters which are in violation of clause 4, rule XXI of the House, limiting the reporting of appropriations to the Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe that anyone could say that these appropriations could stay in the bill because of the fact that they are being reported in a bill providing for statehood. No incidentals of that character are allowed.

I think perhaps the point of order should be supplemented with the language that "it contains appropriations," and that question, under clause 4, rule XXI, can be raised at any time. It seems to me that the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri has made should be sustained.

There are a very considerable number of decisions in section 738 of the manual on privileged questions. The presence of matter not privileged with privileged matter destroys the privileged character of the bill, and there are 7 or 8 different decisions, all of which sustain that position cited at that point.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this point of order should be sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I would like to be heard on the points of order. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I reserve all other points of order against the bill and I should like at this time to make one more point of order directed to the language on page 11, line 10, which reads as follows:

> All grants made or confirmed under this act shall include mineral deposits.

Mr. Speaker, the question which was presented by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is a very simple question. As a matter of fact, two points of order have been raised and I want to address myself first to the point of order which the gentleman from Missouri raised first; that is, that this bill contains an appropriation, and the language, therefore, is not in order in a legislative bill. The language reads as follows:

> Commencing with the year during which Alaska is admitted into the Union, the Secretary of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, shall pay to the State of Alaska 70 percent of the net proceeds, etc.

That might in some minds raise the question of what constitutes an appropriation. I believe the unfailing criterion is that any language in a bill which orders the payment of money from the Treasury without the requirement of further action by the Congress is undoubtedly an appropriation.

There are, as stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], a number of other points in this bill of a similar character. But here is one where the appropriation is direct, where the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations has been clearly invaded by a legislative committee and the payment is directed immediately from the Treasury by the Secretary of the Treasury, and no further action, of course, is required on the part of the Congress; but it is the final action of the Congress in appropriating this money for all time in the future to be paid in annual installments.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Speaker would rule on that question first. I do not want to belabor the point and take up unnecessary time, because that is so obvious and so incontrovertible that it would seem to me we could dispose of that simple question first. Here is an appropriation. It is subject to a point of order. If that point of order is sustained, as I am sure it has to be sustained, then I should like to discuss with the Speaker the further point of order raised by the gentleman.

I do not know whether the Speaker is ready to rule on that point of order or not, because the other one follows immediately behind it and I am prepared to discuss that, also.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman making two points of order?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, sir; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made two points of order. There are two distinct points of order. One: Is this an appropriation contained in a legislative bill? If it is—and it is—then it is subject to a point of order and it must go out.

The second point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the presence of nonprivileged matter in a privileged bill destroys not only that language but destroys the privilege of the bill. It does not destroy the bill; the bill goes on the calendar and the bill may be taken up under proper procedure. But it does destroy the privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to cite authority concerning which there is not the slightest conflict on this subject. It will take me some little time. I hope the Speaker, if he has any doubt on this question, will bear with me, because I have made a very complete study of that question.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If I have that privilege, yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel that the question of appropriation and some of the other matters relative to a statehood bill are minor matters and are necessarily there because the bill proposes to bring a new State into the Union; and naturally, to do that, it must have some conditions under which it would come into the Union?

Does the gentleman feel those practical matters not privileged must be a part of the bill if we are going to complete the bill successfully?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would be glad to discuss that question.

It is true, as the gentleman from Nebraska so well said, that in this class of cases there must be some leeway. The only exception to the rule that I am laying down is that this point of order would not be sustained as to certain matters which might be essential to the purpose and necessary to carry out the purpose of making a State out of the Territory of Alaska, and no point is being made as to those things.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, I think this bill necessarily invades the jurisdiction of nearly every standing committee of the House. It was necessary to do so because it was essential to the central purpose of the bill. It invades the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for instance. On as many as 10 pages of this bill there is reference to various and sundry laws which are amended, so that it might not be necessary to rewrite a great number of laws to make them conform in making Alaska a State.

Those things are essential to the purpose of the bill. But when it comes to paying money out of the United States Treasury to the State of Alaska, that is another thing. It could be just as good a State and just as complete a State without that language as it could be with it. It is not essential to make Alaska a State to do the unprecedented thing that this bill does under the point of order I have just raised, that is, grant to the State of Alaska all of the vast mineral rights of that vast Territory, mineral rights which are vital to the defense of this Nation. Alaska can be a State without grabbing off to itself all of the valuable mineral rights of that great area. That is not essential to it. So that the point is very clear, Mr. Speaker, in the books, both Hinds' and Cannon's Precedents, that only those things which are essential to the central purpose of the act can be in order.

Mr. Speaker, I have brought here with me a very eminent authority on this question, both Hinds' Precedents, and Cannon's Precedents. If the Speaker has any doubt on the question at all I should like to go into it. Let us take for instance section 4633 of volume IV of Hinds' Precedents. This was a case on construction of the rule giving privilege to this committee, which was formerly called the Committee on Public Lands and which had this jurisdiction to report statehood bills. It states:

The insertion of matter not privileged with privileged matter destroys the privileged character of a bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, if an appropriation by the Public Lands Committee is not in order, if those six lines are subject to a point of order, then under that precedent the whole bill is subject to a point of order so far as its privileged, and only so far as its privileged, status is concerned.

Mr. George E. Adams, of Illinois, raised the point of order that the bill contained matter not privileged, and therefore had no privileged character.

The Speaker held: The Chair thinks that is a correct proposition: That a bill which contains two separate matters, one of which is privileged under the rules of the House and the other is not, is subject to the point of order; that is to say, the insertion of matter which was not privileged destroys the privileged character of the other.

I next refer to section 4640 of volume IV of Hinds Precedents.

That was a bill brought in by the Committee on Accounts relative to the contingent fund. It included matter not privileged.

The Chair held that that destroyed the privileged character of the bill.

It is still a good bill. It still can go on the calendar. It can still be taken up when the House so desires, but it does not have the privilege.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many of these citations that I think rather than trespass on the time of the Speaker, I will just read the memorandum that I have on it, and I can go into them further in each case, if it is necessary. But, I do not want to delay the consideration of this matter.

In volume 8 of Cannon's Precedents—Cannon's Precedents by the way are the Precedents written by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri who raised this point of order.

The resolution enlarging the powers and increasing the duties of a standing committee through the employment of a clerk to be paid from the contingent fund was held not to be within the privilege given the Committee on Accounts to report at any time.

Then, the decision goes on to say, and this is repetition, but it runs all through the books and you will not find one single Precedent in any of Hinds' Precedents or Cannon's Precedents that is contrary to what I am reading to you now. It says:

A resolution against which a point of order has been sustained is no longer before the House and amendments therefore are not in order.

Paragraph 2302 of volume 8 of Cannon's Precedents:

A resolution fixing salaries of House employees was held not privileged when reported by the Committee on Accounts.

Volume 8 of Cannon's Precedents, paragraph 2297:

Privilege conferred on bills reported by the Committee on Printing is confined to provisions for printing for the two Houses, and an appropriation for such purpose destroys the privilege of the bill.

In volume 8, paragraph 2300:

Unprivileged matter in a resolution otherwise privileged vitiates the privilege of such resolution.

In Hinds' Precedents IV, paragraph 4622:

In exercising the right to report at any time, committees may not include matters not specified by the rule as within the privilege.

In Hinds' IV, paragraph 4623, we find this language:

The text of a bill containing nonprivileged matter, privilege may not be created by a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute not containing the nonprivileged matter.

In Hinds' IV, paragraph 4624, we find:

The including of matter not privileged destroys the privileged character of a bill.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest here to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado in reply to the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri. There is nothing in his argument that in anywise is contrary to or in conflict with the authorities I have cited to the Speaker.

May I just conclude with this statement, Mr. Speaker, that this and other items in this bill are clearly appropriations on a legislative bill. As appropriations on a legislative bill, they are subject to a point of order without any question of doubt. I know the zealousness with which the Speaker, who has

been Speaker longer than any other man who ever occupied the Chair, as I say, I know his zealousness in preserving the integrity of the rules of the House. To rule that an order for the payment of money out of the Treasury, an appropriation, is in order on a legislative bill strikes the very foundation from under the rules of the House that have governed the House for 150 years. I am sure it must be obvious to the Speaker and to the membership that it is an appropriation and it is therefore subject to a point of order.

Objection has been made to it on that ground, and it simply is not in order. When we have disposed of that point of order, of course the other point of order naturally arises, which is equally well established by all the precedents written by Hinds and by Cannon from the beginning of parliamentary law in this country down to date. They hold that the presence of nonprivileged matter in a privileged bill, while it does not destroy the bill itself it does destroy this privileged status.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to inject myself into the discussion which so far has been confined to experts in the parliamentary field, but as the discussion developed there did come down to the nonexperts in this Chamber the fairly obvious fact that all of these attacks by these distinguished gentlemen have not been aimed primarily at the bill itself but at rule 11, clause 20. If the Speaker is to accept the extremely narrow limitation which would be imposed by those gentlemen, it would be impossible in modern times ever to bring a statehood bill to this floor under rule 11, clause 20, because we would have to have a rule, unless we were willing to come to the floor with a meaningless scrabble, without any appropriation, without any provision for the land. So, Mr. Speaker, I contend the attack is not upon the status of the bill itself but upon rule 11, clause 20.

The SPEAKER. Unless some other Members desire to be heard, the Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair was not notified by anyone that a point of order would be made against consideration of this bill; but anticipating that such a point of order would be made, the Chair, in company with the Parliamentarian of the House, has made a research of decisions of Speakers heretofore.

The Chair might say at this point that some of the decisions cited here do not apply to a statehood bill, and if there is a remedy that remedy would be in Committee of the Whole.

The Chair has thoroughly considered this matter, and trusts everyone believes, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] so kindly said, that this occupant of the chair, after long experience in the House and quite some experience in this position, believes in the integrity of the rules of the House and intends at all times to do his best to preserve and defend them.

Clause 20 of rule 11 provides in part as follows:

> The following named committees shall have leave to report at any time: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, bills for the admission of a new State.

The admission of a new State into the Union is not the question here.

The question, here presented, is one of procedure.

The history of the rule may be found in volume IV of Hinds' Precedents, section 4621. It is stated in that section that in the revision of the rules of 1890 privileged status was given to certain reports from the Committees on Rules, Territories, and Invalid Pensions.

In the 52d Congress the privilege of the Committee on Territories was dropped, but in the 54th and 55th Congresses the privilege was again restored to the Committee on Territories to report bills providing for the admission of new States. That privilege accorded to the Committee on Territories was continued in the standing rules of the House until 1947 when, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, the jurisdiction of the old Committee on Territories was given to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that privilege continues until the present date.

It is interesting to note that the bill providing for the admission of the Territory of Wyoming as a State was reported in 1890 as a privileged bill. No question of order was raised as to its privileged status.

The bill providing for the admission of the Territory of Utah as a State was reported to the 53d Congress by filing with the Clerk, inasmuch as the privileged status given to the Committee on Territories did not exist in the 52d and 53d Congresses.

The bill providing for the admission of the Territory of Idaho as a State was reported during the 51st Congress by delivery to the Clerk, inasmuch as the Committee on Territories at that time did not enjoy the privilege of reporting a bill at any time.

The bill providing for the admission of the Territory of Oklahoma as a State was reported as privileged from the Committee on Territories, and no question of order was raised as to the privileged status.

Bills providing for the admission of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico as States were reported in the 61st Congress as privileged by the Committee on Territories.

In the 62d Congress the joint resolution providing for the admission of the Territories of Arizona and New Mexico as States was reported as privileged, called up as privileged, and passed under the provisions of the rule giving privileged status to certain committees to report at any time as now provided in clause 20 of rule XI.

It is contended that in the exercising of the right to report at any time committees may not include matters not specified by the rule within the privilege.

Mr. Speakers Carlisle, Reed, and Longworth had on various occasions to pass upon phases of this question, although they did not pass specifically on the question of the privilege of the Committee on Territories with respect to bills providing for the admission of new States.

In 1888, Mr. Speaker Carlisle—Hinds' Precedents, volume IV, section 4637—held that the rule giving privilege to reports from the Committee on Public Lands permits the including of matters necessary to accomplishment of the purpose for which privilege is given.

That would be the reply to a great deal of the argument that has been made as to the germaneness of this matter.

Mr. Speaker Reed, in 1896—Hinds' Precedents, volume IV, section 4638—in passing upon a similar question stated:

> The Chair thinks that this provision has always had a liberal construction, and will decide that it is a privileged matter.

Mr. Speaker Longworth, in 1927—Cannon's Precedents, volume VIII, section 2280—in passing upon the privilege of the Committee on Ways and Means to report at any time, stated:

> If a major feature of a bill reported from the Ways and Means Committee relates to revenue the bill is privileged.

This bill relates to the admission of a new State into the Union.

And matters accompanying the bill—

Further quoting Mr. Longworth—

> not strictly raising revenue but incidental to its main purpose do not destroy this privilege.

The bill before us is one to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. Upon a close examination of the bill it will be found that all of the provisions contained therein are necessary for the accomplishment of that objective. It may be argued that some of them are incidental to the main purpose, but as long as they tend toward the accomplishment of that end, such incidental purposes do not destroy the privilege of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to report and call up the pending bill.

It may be said, therefore, that where the major feature—and the Chair hopes the Members will listen to this—that where the major feature of the bill relates to the admission of a new State, lesser provisions incidental thereto do not destroy its privilege when reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, therefore, for these and many other reasons, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of consideration and demand a vote on the question of consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question of consideration, the Chair is informed, cannot be raised against the motion. That is decided on the motion itself. The Members will vote on whether or not they are going to consider this bill, if they ask for a rollcall. The question now is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. May I submit a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Under what circumstances can the question of consideration be raised?

The SPEAKER. The Chair tried to say a moment ago that it cannot be raised against the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole, because that is tantamount to consideration, and the House will have an opportunity to vote on that motion.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In other words, if we demand a vote on that question, then that will be tantamount to raising the question of consideration?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 217, nays 172, not voting, 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—217

Addonizio	Fogarty	Morrison
Albert	Forand	Moss
Allen, Calif.	Ford	Moulder
Anderson, Mont.	Frelinghuysen	Multer
	Friedel	Natcher
Anfuso	Fulton	Nimtz
Ashley	Garmatz	Norblad
Aspinall	Glenn	O'Brien, Ill.
Ayres	Gordon	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bailey	Gray	O'Hara, Ill.
Baker	Green, Oreg.	O'Konski
Baldwin	Green, Pa.	Osmers
Baring	Griffin	Passman
Barrett	Griffiths	Patterson
Bass, N. H.	Hagen	Pelly
Bass, Tenn.	Hale	Perkins
Beckworth	Haskell	Pfost
Bennett, Fla.	Hays, Ohio	Polk
Bentley	Healey	Porter
Berry	Hébert	Price
Blatnik	Heselton	Prouty
Boggs	Hill	Quie
Boland	Holifield	Rabaut
Bolling	Holland	Reece, Tenn.
Boyle	Holmes	Reuss
Bray	Holtzman	Rhodes, Ariz.
Breeding	Horan	Rhodes, Pa.
Brooks, Tex.	Hyde	Riehlman
Broomfield	Ikard	Robison, N. Y.
Brown, Mo.	Jarman	Robsion, Ky.
Brownson	Jensen	Rodino
Byrd	Johnson	Rogers, Colo.
Byrne, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Rooney
Byrne, Pa.	Judd	Roosevelt
Canfield	Karsten	Santangelo
Carrigg	Kearns	Saund
Celler	Keating	Saylor
Chamberlain	Kee	Scott, Pa.
Chelf	Kelly, N. Y.	Seely-Brown
Chenoweth	Keogh	Sheehan
Christopher	King	Shelley
Church	Kirwan	Sisk
Clark	Kluczynski	Smith, Calif.
Coad	Knox	Spence
Coffin	Krueger	Staggers
Collier	Laird	Steed
Corbett	Lane	Sullivan
Cunningham, Iowa	Lankford	Talle
	Lesinski	Taylor
Curtin	Libonati	Teague, Calif.
Curtis, Mo.	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Dawson, Ill.	Loser	Teller
Dawson, Utah	McCarthy	Tewes
Delay	McCormack	Thompson, N. J.
Dennison	McFall	Thompson, Tex.
Denton	McGovern	Thomson, Wyo.
Diggs	Machrowicz	Thornberry
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Tollefson
Dixon	Mack, Wash.	Udall
Dollinger	Madden	Ullman
Dooley	Magnuson	Vanik
Dorn, N. Y.	Mailliard	Van Zandt
Doyle	Marshall	Vorys
Dwyer	May	Walter
Eberharter	Meader	Weaver
Edmondson	Merrow	Westland
Evins	Metcalf	Widnall
Falion	Miller, Calif.	Wier
Farbstein	Miller, Nebr.	Wright
Fascell	Mills	Yates
Feighan	Montoya	Young
Fino	Morano	Zablocki
Flood	Morgan	Zelenko

NAYS—172

Abbitt	Gary	Mumma
Abernethy	Gathings	Murray
Adair	Gavin	Neal
Alexander	George	Nicholson
Alger	Grant	Norrell
Allen, Ill.	Gubser	O'Hara, Minn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gwinn	O'Neill
	Haley	Ostertag
Andrews	Halleck	Philbin
Arends	Harden	Pilcher
Ashmore	Hardy	Pillion
Avery	Harris	Poage
Barden	Harrison, Nebr.	Poff
Bates	Harrison, Va.	Preston
Baumhart	Harvey	Rains
Beamer	Hemphill	Ray
Becker	Henderson	Reed
Belcher	Herlong	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Riley
Betts	Hiestand	Roberts
Blitch	Hoeven	Robeson, Va.
Bolton	Hoffman	Rogers, Fla.
Bonner	Holt	Rogers, Mass.
Bosch	Hosmer	Rogers, Tex.
Boykin	Huddleston	Rutherford
Brooks, La.	Hull	Sadlak
Brown, Ga.	Jackson	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Jennings	Schenck
Broyhill	Johansen	Scherer
Budge	Jonas	Schwengel
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Scrivner
Bush	Kean	Scudder
Byrnes, Wis.	Kilburn	Selden
Cannon	Kilday	Sikes
Cederberg	Kilgore	Siler
Chiperfield	Kitchin	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Lafore	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Landrum	Smith, Kans.
Coudert	Latham	Smith, Miss.
Cramer	LeCompte	Smith, Va.
Cretella	McCulloch	Springer
Cunningham, Nebr.	McDonough	Stauffer
	McGregor	Taber
Curtis, Mass.	McIntire	Thomas
Dague	McIntosh	Tuck
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Van Pelt
Delaney	McVey	Vinson
Derounian	Macdonald	Wainwright
Devereux	Mahon	Wharton
Donohue	Martin	Whitener
Dorn, S. C.	Mason	Whitten
Elliott	Matthews	Wigglesworth
Everett	Michel	Williams, Miss.
Fisher	Miller, Md.	Williams, N. Y.
Flynt	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
Forrester	Minshall	Winstead
Fountain	Mitchell	Withrow
Frazier	Moore	Younger

NOT VOTING—40

Auchincloss	Gregory	Scott, N. C.
Bow	Gross	Sheppard
Buckley	Hays, Ark.	Shuford
Burdick	Hillings	Sieminski
Carnahan	James	Thompson, La.
Colmer	Jenkins	Trimble
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Utt
Dent	Knutson	Vursell
Dies	Lennon	Watts
Dowdy	Morris	Willis
Durham	Patman	Wilson, Calif.
Engle	Powell	Wolverton
Fenton	Radwan	
Granahan	Rivers	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Scott of North Carolina against.

Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Jenkins against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Fenton against.

Mrs. Granahan for, with Mr. Radwan against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. James against.

Mr. Engle for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Wilson of California for, with Mr. Hays of Arkansas against.

Mrs. Knutson for, with Mr. Dies against.

Mr. Sieminski for, with Mr. Gregory against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Watts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Lennon with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Gross.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] for 1 hour.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Gladly.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I heard the Chair recognize the gentleman from New York for 1 hour. Can the Chair tell me how much time is expected to be consumed on this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not within the knowledge of the Chair, and it is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORANO. What is the parliamentary situation with respect to time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has been recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORANO. Does that mean that every other Member of the House can be recognized for 1 hour?

The CHAIRMAN. He may use all or part of it. He may use less than an hour if he wishes to.

Mr. MORANO. Can every other Member of the House be recognized for 1 hour, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the situation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe before we went into the Committee of the Whole it was agreed that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] would control half of the time and the gentleman from Nebraska half of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection was made to that request.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can clear up the situation a little bit. It is my understanding that each Member could be recognized for 1 hour, which would mean a total of over 400 hours, but I know that this is a very reasonable body, and I assume that after reasonable debate a majority would vote to limit the time. I would hope that that would be by tomorrow.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman then expects to move, after reasonable debate, that the debate be terminated?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes. I might add that there has been some discussion on both sides on that subject,

and with people who are opposed to the legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, can the gentleman tell me whether that has to be done in the Committee or in the House?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. In the House, it is my understanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand the procedure, at the appropriate time someone may make a motion, the gentleman or some member of the committee, that the Committee rise, and then when we go back into the House, the House could then determine and agree on time and go back into the Committee of the Whole again. That is my understanding.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful as an individual and as a Member of this House that the distinguished House of Representatives voted by a rather substantial margin to hear the arguments for and against statehood for Alaska. I think, Mr. Chairman, that that decision was in the fine tradition of the House. It would have been unthinkable to many of us that we would have refused to hear the arguments for or against such a vital matter as the admission of a new State in the Union.

I would like to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that I have been assigned the task of making the first presentation of the arguments for the admission of Alaska to statehood. It is a difficult subject and I should like to cover some of the arguments which already have been made in various places against statehood; and for that reason, and so it may be understood that there is no discourtesy on my part, I do not propose to yield, if any Member feels impelled to ask that I do so, during the next several minutes.

One thing I should like to make very clear. I do not think anyone in this House has a higher regard or a deeper respect for the members of the distinguished Committee on Rules than I have, and the presence of this bill on the floor under its present privileged status was not an impertinent gesture on the part of those who favor statehood for Alaska. It was a gesture, if you will, of last resort. We felt—in fact, we were told rather plainly—that if there was a rule, it might be in August, but there was some question whether or not there would be a rule. We felt, and I think fairly, that when the two major parties of this country——

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the correction of an impression he may have left?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. In view of the fact that the gentleman has mentioned the Committee on Rules, the inference might have been left that all members of the Committee on Rules were opposed to statehood for Alaska. That is not true. As a member of the Rules Committee I wish it recorded that I am for this legislation.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. If that was the impression I left, I regret it and I withdraw it, because I know that there are some members of the Committee on Rules who favor statehood for Alaska. And I might say for the benefit of those who oppose it, my respect and regard for them is not lessened in any degree, especially those who have very firm, very strong feelings on the subject. My only quarrel, if I have one today, is with those Members who might be so indifferent on this major issue that they will be swayed by minor and irrelevant arguments. And I should like to proceed shortly to some of those minor and irrelevant arguments. But I have one further explanation at this point.

Some Members may wonder why the bill H. R. 7999 bears the name of the Member from New York and not that of the distinguished Delegate from Alaska who has worked so long and so hard in this field. I want to tell you that my name on the bill was, in a sense, the gift of the Delegate from Alaska. He requested that I report my bill. I know one of his motives. He wanted the bill to come before the House in the name of a Member from the State with the largest population in the United States so that we could demonstrate that in the large States such as New York, Pennsylvania, California and others, there are Members of this House and citizens of those States who do not look down their noses at the smaller population in Alaska and say, "We want no part of you." I do not know whether it occurred to the Delegate from Alaska or not, but I think there is a little significance in the fact that my home district is Albany, N. Y., which was writing pages of American history 150 years before the shots were fired at Lexington and Concord. Not too long ago we adopted a resolution in this House as a tribute to Benjamin Franklin declaring Albany, N. Y., the birthplace of the Union.

I do not say this as a chamber of commerce member might, but merely to point out that in my district, a part of the Union from the very beginning, we do not accept the concept that this Nation would have been better off if the Thirteen Original States sat like haughty dowagers on their eastern seaboard and regarded the rest of the Nation as a fishing or hunting preserve or, perhaps, a place of exploitation as Alaska has been for so long.

I say to you today that we have more than just another bill before us.

We have in a sense a rendezvous with our future. We are going to decide something here today that is not so important to you and to me, certainly not so important to those of us who have passed midlife, but it is of vital importance to those who will follow us.

I say to you, too, to those who might suggest, "Well, this is not the year, maybe next year, maybe 2 years from now," that Alaska has been listening to that for 42 years. I tell you that it is my conclusion and sincere belief that if we reject Alaskan statehood this year it is dead for a generation, because this year we have a certain amount of extra steam, if you will, behind this measure.

We have editorial support from 679 newspapers in my district and in yours. We have the support of 12 out of 13 of the residents of the United States who have expressed views on the subject. Members of this House who have followed the practice of sending questionnaires to their constituents have been surprised in many instances to discover very overwhelming favor for statehood for Alaska. In my own district it is eight to one. I might say that was demonstrated not by my questionnaire but because a local newspaper published the questionnaire from the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG]. He wanted to know. I do not know what the result in his district was but I know what it was in mine.

On that same questionnaire there was this question:

Do you favor a reduction in Federal taxes by reducing nonmilitary expenditures?

Three to one favored that, a substantial margin, but far short of the eight to one who favored statehood for Alaska.

I daresay that in the districts of 75 percent of the Members of this House the people want statehood for Alaska.

One of the problems is, they want it but they do not get angry enough about it. We are able to stand up and say, "Oh, yes, my district favors it, but I am against it." That is fine. I think Members should be independent. I think you are entitled to say to the public, if you want to, "You do not know what you are talking about. Papa knows best." But let us fit this public approval into the mosaic, if you will. If we reject public opinion as uninformed, then we must necessarily turn to those who are informed.

In this House you give the responsibility for the Territories to our committee. We do not claim to be experts, but we do claim to be practiced, we do claim to know the facts, and our committee 24 to 6 reported out this bill you have before you.

The Secretary of the Interior favors this bill, and I think that flies in the face of the idea that a Federal official never wants to disgorge any authority once given to him. The Secretary of the Interior knows the conditions in Alaska.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that is important because we have a large military establishment in Alaska, testified that statehood not only would not hamper our military effort in Alaska but would aid it by granting stability in the area where the military operates so largely.

I realize that some of the most effective and powerful men in this House do not agree that Alaska should be a State. I know their arguments. I have heard them. But I should like to suggest that the history of statehood in this country is a sordid chapter in the sense of deals, and compromises.

Now we have a chance, just once, to say to a single Territory, "On your own merits, without regard to what happens to any other Territory anywhere else, you are admitted because it is for the good of the United States."

I say from reading the record of the past, that those distinguished gentle-

men who will follow me in opposition are in distinguished company, indeed. I often read, as all of us do, the writings on the wall in back of me in the Chamber here. I do not know whether Daniel Webster would have chosen the quotation which you see here in this Chamber as the one quotation of all the things that he said. But, I am rather happy that this one has been chosen because in this quotation he said,

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

If Daniel Webster were in this Chamber today, I am very sure he would not want to be remembered for his statement that we should not push into the West and that the Republic itself might topple and fall if we had anything to do with those wild men west of the Missouri. Well, in that territory to which Daniel Webster was opposed, we have some of the greatest States in the entire Nation today. I say to the modern day Daniel Websters, and I sincerely believe they belong in that category, make very sure, if you are quoted one day on the walls of this Chamber, that you will not be quoted as saying that Alaska has no future in our national scheme because I predict that if you give Alaska statehood within a quarter of a century there will be a minimum of 10 million people in that great land. A very good friend of mine in this House, one of the principal opponents of statehood advanced the rather novel idea that because, as he says, there are a lot of Communists in Hawaii, Alaska should not be a State. That is a very difficult argument to answer unless you fall back upon your old training in school and employ the principle of reductio ad absurdum. You might say that all Germans west and east are Communists because some Germans in East Germany are under Communist control. You might say that because there are Communist dominated countries in Europe, therefore, England and Ireland and all the rest of the countries are Communists also. I am rather happy that the gentleman has raised this question because so far as Alaska is concerned, and the testimony will show it, in this great land under the frowning eyes of the Russians themselves, a land which extends to Siberia, there are fewer Communists than anywhere in the United States. Only yesterday I spoke to a former United States Attorney from Alaska and he told me that in spite of the special care because of our great military installations there that there had not been one single case of attempted sabotage of our military installations. Ten suspected Reds in all of Alaska—1 to every 20,000 and, yet, the distinguished gentleman from New York, which has 1 Communist for every 1,600 people, would have you believe that because there is a certain labor leader in Hawaii, Alaska is communistic. We have separated the Alaskan and Hawaiian bills deliberately.

They should not swing upon one another. Each is entitled to a decision on its own merits. I know someone will say before this debate is over, "Where is Hawaii? This is discrimination. This is politics." But I defy any Member of this House, including members of our committee, to show where in one instance I have played politics on this issue. They know that, but they want to mention Hawaii for this reason: Once you inject Hawaii in the debate, then you get the response, "Won't we one day be asked to admit Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, then Jupiter and Saturn and Mars?" forgetting that the same House which is making the decision on Alaskan statehood this week holds the key to any future attempt by any area anywhere to come into the Union. We are deciding only on Alaska. I am not opposed to Hawaii. I shall do all in my power, if Alaska is given statehood, to bring the Hawaiian bill before this House for fair and full consideration. We see what happened 3 years ago when we had a shotgun wedding in this House; when Hawaii and Alaska were picked up by the seat of the pants and thrown into one bill. No one ever talked about Alaska. All we had were pictures of alleged Communists in Hawaii.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very fine exposition of this bill and I think there should be a quorum present to hear him. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-six Members are present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Auchincloss	Gregory	Powell
Bass, Tenn.	Gross	Radwan
Buckley	Gubser	Rivers
Burdick	Hays, Ark.	Scott, N. C.
Carnahan	Hillings	Sheppard
Carrigg	James	Shuford
Celler	Jenkins	Sieminski
Colmer	Kearney	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Keating	Springer
Dent	Knutson	Teague, Tex.
Dies	LeCompte	Trimble
Dowdy	Lennon	Vinson
Durham	Michel	Vursell
Engle	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Fenton	Morris	Wolverton
Granahan	Moulder	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7999, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 379 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman from Virginia for the temporary respite and particularly because I was about to discuss a matter which I know to be of very grave concern to him. I know the distinguished gentleman from Virginia is opposed to this bill, but I think it would be a very bad mistake to assume that because the gentleman is opposed to the bill that some of the matters he raises in opposition are not matters of grave concern. I know that the gentleman is and has been concerned about what have been described as giveaways. I would like to point out, if I may, that when we are considering statehood for Alaska, we have to throw away our ordinary concepts of geography. We are talking about a territory one-fifth the size of the United States, a territory, if the distinguished Members from the State of Texas will forgive me, which is twice the size of Texas and everybody knows that Texas is big indeed. So when we talk about land grants we cannot talk in terms of 1 million or 5 million or even 10 million acres. We are all aware that if you drop a million acres into the middle of Rhode Island, it would be quite a hunk of ground. In Texas, it would probably be a ranch and in Alaska, it would be a garden patch. Especially, when we figure the land must be selected from land which will not serve any purpose to the new state. We have in this bill, as I recall, a land grant of approximately 184 million acres.

That is a staggering figure, but I suggest that we consider it in percentage terms. It means that the new State will still have control of less than one-half of its own land and that of the more than 50 percent which will be retained by the Federal Government, there is included some of the richest oil land in Alaska. Furthermore, and I can speak only for myself, when we arrive at a point where the bill is open to amendment, I shall cheerfully accept personally an amendment which would reduce the acreage to 101 million or 102 million. That would be substantially less than one-third of the land in Alaska turned over to the new State. You might say what about these minerals and what about this loot that might be given away if we give the new State power to select mineral lands. It is my considered judgment that these mineral lands will have more protection when we give them to the State of Alaska than they have now because the Federal Government presently leases those mineral lands and also grants patents for those lands. The new State of Alaska under its own constitution is forbidden to grant patents. May I say that if there is a giveaway, with which I do not agree, it is already taking place because 90 percent of the revenue that the Federal Government presently collects from mineral leases in Alaska is turned back to the Territory of Alaska. My advice to the new State would be not to select mineral lands—to select other land and if I may emphasize just a little bit more what I had in mind about the great expanse of territory and the necessity of using percentages figures, some years ago we passed a bill in the House giving 100,000 acres of land to the University of Alaska to help support that great institution. The latest advice I have is that from those 100,000 acres, and that is a lot of acres, they have not received enough revenue to equip their basketball team. So when you talk about a million acres in Alaska, you have to consider the millions of acres which are not given to the new State.

You have got to consider the millions which are retained by the Federal Gov-

ernment, and you must consider that those retained acres include the richest oil land. It has always been my impression, though not spelled out in law, that land in an incorporated territory, in an embryonic State, is actually held by the Federal Government in trust for the future State. So in that sense it is not a question of Uncle Sam tossing a lot of minerals and a lot of oil to an unscrupulous leadership in a new State.

I think the question comes up: Can Alaska, with 212,000 people, support statehood? In the considered judgment of the committee who listened to all the witnesses, it can and will. And with the provisions we have in this bill dealing with the land tax base, with the seal fisheries, and so forth, the additional cost of statehood over and above the present cost of Territorial government will be approximately $2 million a year. I am not belittling $2 million, but I assert that it is within the means of the people of Alaska. I know some people up there oppose it. I know the suggestion will be made that the people of Alaska way down underneath do not want statehood. We have had polls which indicate that they do not want it. But every time they have gone to the voting place on any question dealing with statehood, the vote has been for statehood, up to and including the most recent primary in Alaska, where there was a candidate who favored the commonwealth. In Alaska you can cross party lines in a primary. There was no contest on the Democratic side, so the Democrats could easily, if they opposed statehood, have gone over the line and voted for this commonwealth candidate who was a Republican, a gentleman who favored a commonwealth—a commonwealth is a tempting status—and they polled only 10 percent of the entire vote cast in the Alaska primary. But we are willing again to compromise. If it is the sense of this House that we have an amendment providing for a plebescite when the statehood bill comes to the voters of Alaska, we are willing to go along with it, because we have no desire to jam statehood down the throats of any people. Nor do we accept at face value the "aginners," because away back in the Revolutionary War there were some people who did not believe this country could get along as a separate nation. The Tories were not entirely disloyal. They felt that they were sound in their judgment, but they were opposed to independence. We have Tories in every State and in every Territory—people who just love the status quo, who think that maybe it will cost them a little more to be a State, and they think that the price is too high here for the great honor, the great privilege of being a full citizen of the United States, qualified to vote for President and Vice President and their own Governor.

Now I would like to go into the question of what this means to all of us. I think that we could very well today forget this talk of colonialism, forget that Alaska has been hanging fire in the limbo of an unincorporated Territory for 90 years, forget the aspirations and hopes of the people there; and think selfishly, if you will, of our own districts and the rest of the Nation. I tell you that I believe, as far as my district is concerned, statehood is a must.

Small population? Every State that has come into the Union has added to the wealth and population of my State, and I feel that this great Territory properly developed will pour its benefits out over every one of the 48 States of the Nation. I think we will save money in the long run; I think we will reduce the cost of our Military Establishment in Alaska.

There are those who say that Alaska is too far away, that it is a Never-Never Land, a fabulous place up north which has polar bears and Eskimos. Unfortunately, some of the things about our modern civilization are already in Alaska, neon lights and other things which interfere with the intrinsic beauty of the place.

Here is a Territory which is not a forgotten outpost, which has its own university, which devotes half of its budget to education. It is composed of people from your State, your city, my State and my city. These people are loyal Americans in every sense of the word, and the only difference between them and us is that they have preserved some of the pioneering spirit of which we speak so highly in this country. The men and women of Alaska are our kinfolk; they are the pioneers of 1958. We talked with them, we talked with them in every part of that enormous land. In 1955 we went into tiny fishing villages; we went into the modern cities of Anchorage and Fairbanks, and even went to Point Barrow up in Eskimoland.

When we talk about people it is the concern of this House. I can describe what they are in no better way than to paraphrase an editorial which had to do not with statehood for Alaska but the recent celebration of the 100th anniversary of the statehood of Minnesota. The editorial told of all the material things in Minnesota, but then it added, and I shall use Alaska instead of Minnesota in reading this:

> Alaska is people. They represent the finest part of the pioneer tradition of which we are so proud. They were ready and eager to face a climate that is sometimes less than benign, to work a soil that could be responsive. They wanted to make a new world in something of the pattern of the old one. They brought with them a dignity, fidelity, and industry that did not brook compromise.

Then the editorial continued, and I think this is significant to us who come from other parts of the country:

> Each one of us may have his own little part of the country to which he is especially devoted. There is no reason to be ashamed of these local prides and loyalties, but there is reason to be gratified by the splendor of regions other than our own; and because we are so proud to be Americans, it is good to know that Alaska and its people may be a part of us.

I think we all have been disturbed from time to time, those of us who live in congested areas, by the fact that we are living in this country, many parts of it, upon our capital, as it were. In some areas of this country water must be used over again because of the shortage. In another generation, perhaps more specifically by the time my eldest grandson is old enough to serve in this distinguished body, we are told that we will have 70 million more people in the United States. I suggest that it is a responsibility of our generation to make very sure that the gates to expansion and opportunity are not closed. I suggest that many of those 70 million, our children and our grandchildren, will find that opportunity in the great new State of Alaska.

May I suggest this, too. We have been alarmed, some of us, recently by the reception given to our Vice President in South America. And, as I read of the stones and the filth which were cast not upon RICHARD NIXON the individual but upon every man and woman in this country whom he represented there, I thought of a people far to the north of South America, a people who do not have to be bribed or given foreign aid or cajoled, people who are loyal to us now. And I thought of how true were the words of Shakespeare when he suggested that "The friends thou hast, and their adoption, tried, grapple them to thys soul with hoops of steel."

I have one final thought. I have not covered all of the arguments against this bill or all of the arguments for it, because others more able than I will follow. But, I was handed a few days ago an old copy of a wire service story. I will not read it, but I will simply tell you that it quoted Molotov, wherever he is now, Outer Mongolia, as saying that the Communists in Russia never agreed to the sale of Alaska to the United States, implying that they still have a claim, perhaps to be asserted sometime in the future.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

Anderson, Mont.	Dowdy	Michel
Auchincloss	Durham	Morris
Bailey	Eberharter	Moulder
Bentley	Engle	Powell
Blatnik	Evins	Radwan
Brooks, La.	Fenton	Rivers
Buckley	Gray	Scott, N. C.
Burdick	Gregory	Sheppard
Carnahan	Gross	Shuford
Celler	Gubser	Sieminski
Christopher	Haskell	Smith, Kans.
Clark	Hays, Ark.	Smith, Miss.
Coffin	Hillings	Spence
Colmer	James	Springer
Davis, Tenn.	Jenkins	Steed
Dawson, Utah	Kearney	Teague, Tex.
Dellay	Kilburn	Thomas
Dent	Knutson	Trimble
Dies	LeCompte	Vinson
Dingell	Lennon	Watts
	Lesinski	Willis

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill

(H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, finding itself without a quorum he directed the roll to be called, when 366 Members responded to their names, disclosing a quorum to be present, and he submitted herewith a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] is recognized.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I was very close to the concluding point when the gentleman made the point of order of no quorum. The interval did permit me to think of one final argument which has been advanced against statehood for Alaska. I think perhaps deep down in our minds it is the prevailing objection, perhaps the most important to many Members. Very simply put, it is this: Should 212,000 people have 2 representatives in the United States Senate when a State such as New York, with 16 million people, has the same number? I know that is difficult to answer. If we assume that there should be geographical representation in the United States Senate, if we accept that, then we are turning back the clock 171 years. We are also saying directly or indirectly: "We from New York, why should not we have nine Senators? Why should not many of the smaller States have only one, or none, if you will?" Yet, when we look at what some of these smaller States have produced in our United States Senate we are very happy about the geographical representation.

I know that I, as a resident of a small State, would resent rather deeply the suggestion, directly or indirectly, that I had two representatives in the United States Senate because we made a mistake somewhere along the line. That is a reflection upon the membership in the House; it is a reflection on some of these distinguished and most able ladies and gentlemen from smaller States.

You know, as well as I, that many States came into being with populations smaller than that which Alaska now has. If you will look at the record of population totals you will discover a very significant thing, and that is the tremendous growth in population in each of those States following admission to statehood. For example, to select one, Ohio: Population at time of admission, 80,000; population at succeeding census, 230,000. Indiana: At time of admission, 63,000; population at succeeding census, 147,000.

I could recite others, but they all fall into the same pattern, and I am convinced that if you suffer this small population in Alaska to have 2 spokesmen in the United States Senate, within a very few years those same 2 Senators will be representing millions of people, because the potential in Alaska is as great as or greater than it was in these other States.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. In order that the figures that the gentleman gave may be in proper perspective, to wit, those with regard to Indiana and Ohio, I would like to say that at the time those States were admitted into the Union, and from a column that does no show in the report, Indiana's population at that time was 1.5269 percent of the total United States population. At the time of Ohio's admission her population represented 3.187 percent of the population of the United States. At the present time the population of Alaska represents only .0853 percent of the total population of the United States.

So under those circumstances there is a considerable difference when you compare sizes of population at the time of admission than there is when you use the bare unweighted numbers.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The gentleman will recall that I was discussing only the growth which followed admission to statehood to support the contention of our committee that statehood has never been a failure in the United States. But if the gentleman wants to press the point percentagewise, then when we get into that field where he compares his State of 14 million with some of the smaller States I wonder if he would have in mind the desirability of taking from those States one or both of their Senators and giving them to the great State of California? I know it would not be constitutionally possible, but surely the thought must be there when you are applying a population argument to the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. On the question of contiguous territory, at the time California and Oregon were admitted to the Union there was a tremendous area separating California and Oregon from the other States of the Union. They were not contiguous to the States of the Union at that time.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. The gentleman is so very, very correct.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to the statement by the majority leader. I think that is one of the subjects that I did not touch upon because another Member will handle it. But, when we use the word "contiguous," surely it must be a relative term. Surely, with a territory which in these modern days is close enough with modern transportation to permit this individual to listen to a world series game on the radio in a hotel in Juneau, Alaska, and then on the next afternoon to see the second game of that series on television in my hometown in Albany, N. Y., you will have to admit that Alaska today is much closer to the rest of the United States than even some of our Midwestern States were at the time of their admission. I stated or intended to state that for 20 years the Soviet Government has been feeding to the Russian people the deliberate lie that the Czar had no right to sell Alaska to the United States; that actually the money, the $7.2 million, was only a reimbursement to Russia for the expenses incurred by the Czar in sending Russian fleets to San Francisco and New York at a time during the Civil War. Well, we know that we are never going to concede that argument. But, I suggest, added to all the other arguments which have been or will be advanced, that it might be a fine gesture by the United States to meet this challenge from the Kremlin once and for all, and the simplest way to do it is to plant right on the Siberian border in Alaska the American flag with 49 stars.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Gladly.

Mr. ASPINALL. I just wish to compliment and congratulate my good personal friend and colleague on the committee and of this great body for his presentation here today. It is my opinion that he stands today as the No. 1 man in the study of Alaskan matters and Alaska's quest for statehood. He has been doing an admirable job.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I am indeed very grateful.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to say that my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York, has made an eloquent as well as a powerful speech in behalf of Alaska statehood. He has completely persuaded me, by the way. I want him to know that all of the Alaskans, meaning most of them, who are for statehood, particularly appreciate what he is doing for us now and what he has done for us before. Now, the gentleman said awhile ago "Protect your Alaska." Is it not true that during the hearings over which you presided some 600,000 words of testimony were taken down and later reduced to printed form?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes; the gentleman is correct. We did take 600,000 words of testimony. We covered I do not know how many thousands of miles, and we covered the whole subject of Alaska so thoroughly that we could think of but one description for the title which emerged, and that was "Alaska, 1955."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman this, if I may. Did he have opportunity on that trip to talk to, and be talked to by, the people who were against statehood as well as those resident in the Territory who were for statehood?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would like to say to the distinguished Delegate that we sought out people who were opposed to statehood because it was too easy to find people who supported it. We had to look for opponents, and even the opponents, our record will show, conceded that the vast majority of the people in Alaska disagreed with their views.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman, I am sure, is aware of the fact that the Constitution does not permit any State to be

deprived of its two Senators; perhaps it is one section of the Constitution that is unamendable. The gentleman is aware of that?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman is aware of the clause that provides for the possibility of one State having less than two Senators; in other words, a State may consent to have less than two Senators. So that the framers of our Constitution did have in mind the possibility that there might be less than two Senators, and that portion of the Constitution also is unamendable. The gentleman is aware of that?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I concede that the Constitution does not permit any State, having 2 Senators, to lose 1 of them. I merely wanted to suggest, when I raised that point, that if we were logical, we would be quarreling with the fact that somewhere along the line we did not provide 9 Senators for our State, perhaps 7 for California, and 7 or 8 for Pennsylvania, which would leave some of our States in very bad shape, indeed. I do not concede the gentleman's point that there is a provision in the Constitution permitting a State to have less than two Senators, although I know the gentleman's arguments in that direction, and I know he will explore them fully when he takes his place in the well. All I can say is that I violently disagree with the idea of admitting half a State or of giving a Territory half of statehood. It is all or nothing, and I am very calmly confident that if the time ever came when the two Senators from Alaska, representing whatever number of people they represented, were voting on a great national issue, they would vote in the public interest. And I am very sure that there is just as great a possibility of Alaska producing another Borah as did Idaho, or of producing another MANSFIELD, as has Montana.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the man who has, in my opinion, done more to promote the cause of statehood for Alaska than any other one person who is a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Subcommittee on Territories. I think the gentleman from New York has been a very able leader and has been a true advocate of statehood. I know that he has endeared himself not only to the people of Alaska but to all people of the United States who are interested in looking at statehood for Alaska as a national problem and not on a small, selfish basis as are some of the opponents, in my opinion.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I have a question which has nothing to do with the pros or cons of statehood, but for the purpose of information. What will happen during the period when Alaska becomes a State, as far as a limitation on the number of Representatives in the House is concerned? Would they have representation or would they not?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I am glad the gentleman raised that point. The bill provides that until after the next census, the membership of the House would be increased by one; and after the next census the figure would go back to 435.

I have had people suggest, "Well, maybe that might be my seat." With the changes that are going to take place around the country after the next census, I think it is straining at a gnat if we are worrying about what seat will go out as a result of admitting Alaska to the Union. I may say to the gentleman that I have a very strong suspicion as to whose seat it will be. I think it might very well be that of the gentleman from New York, who is now speaking.

Mr. PELLY. Will the gentleman explain as to the other body? Would there be any temporary changes in the other body?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. No; because the representation in the Senate has nothing to do with population. There would be two Senators for the State or, as the gentleman from New York has suggested, and if he is correct, maybe one.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, Alaska was promised statehood when it was annexed in 1867.

The promise was clear and explicit.

It is found in article III of the treaty with Russia signed March 30, 1867, by Secretary of State William H. Seward and ratified by the United States Senate.

Article III reads as follows:

> The inhabitants of the ceded Territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within 3 years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded Territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion. The uncivilized tribes will be subject to such laws and regulations as the United States may, from time to time, adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country.

The essence of that pledge is contained in the words "the inhabitants shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

There is only one way in which those inhabitants of Alaska can be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States. That way is to admit Alaska to statehood. There is no other way.

For it is clear that only by statehood will the people of Alaska be able to enjoy—

The right to vote for President and Vice President, which they cannot do now;

The right to be represented in the Congress by two United States Senators and a Representative with a vote, which they do not have now; and

The right to be freed from a variety of restrictions including those imposed upon them by the Organic Act of 1912 and by the act of Congress of July 30, 1886, which prescribed various prohibitions for American Territories, still sufficient in number to be subsequently formed into 10 States.

The pledge made in the Treaty of Cession, 91 years ago, conveys a solemn obligation. A treaty was then and still is the highest law of the land.

The actions of Congress subsequent to ratification of the treaty give further substance—if such substance were needed—to Alaska's right to statehood. That right to statehood inheres in the ratification of the treaty also by the House of Representatives in the following year, 1868, when the House authorized and appropriated the $7,200,000 purchase price. It inheres in the extension to Alaska of the laws relating to customs, commerce, and navigation, and the establishment of a collection district in the newly acquired Territory.

By these acts—the United States Supreme Court decided in the so-called "Insular Cases" early in this century—Alaska was incorporated into the Union in 1868. As an incorporated Territory it became an "inchoate State." As such it cannot by any act of Congress be alienated, given independence or any other political status, as can be done and has been done with unincorporated territories or insular possessions. These never paid Federal taxes, while Alaska pays all Federal taxes and under the uniformity clause of the Constitution cannot be relieved of them. Taxation without representation should, obviously, be terminated. The destiny of Alaska, an incorporated Territory—taken, literally, into the body of the Union—can only be statehood. However, those important Supreme Court decisions in the Insular Cases, while buttressing Alaska's right to statehood beyond peradventure, are not needed to strengthen the explicit commitment of the treaty with Russia made 91 years ago.

The only questions then to be answered to determine the time of Alaska's admission to the equality of statehood are whether the Territory has met and can meet the tests of political maturity and economic sufficiency.

Or, to put it in another way: First, are Alaskans capable of self-government? And, second, are their resources sufficient to support a State?

I am deeply convinced—as a member of the committee dealing with our Territories for 14 years, and as its chairman in the last 2 Congresses, which has given me ample opportunity to become familiar with this important issue—that Alaska is fully qualified on both counts.

Let us look at the first question. Are Alaskans politically mature? They ought to be after 90 years of incorporation, the longest duration of pupilage

in our history. Let us take a look at that history.

Our fellow citizens who went west to become Alaskans went of their own free will. They went, in part, in quest of greater opportunity and greater freedom. They went, inspired, in part, by the love of adventure which lies deep in every American heart. They went westward into the unknown, open and emptier spaces of our land as generations of Americans had before them. And they went beyond their predecessors. Settling America's farthest west and farthest north they wrote the final chapter in the greatest epic of all history—the American epic. Yet, it was final only in the sense that they had reached land's end and could go no further.

But if theirs was a concluding chapter in the westward course, it was but the beginning of a great new episode, a still greater adventure—and one of national import. For those pioneers who braved every hardship, who conquered the wilderness, have set themselves in those northernmost latitudes and westernmost meridians of our continent to establish a great and worthy outpost of American life. Overcoming great natural obstacles and still greater distantly manmade handicaps, they have laid the foundation of a robust society whose destiny it is to be not merely a bulwark of defense for the Western Hemisphere but a citadel of democracy and freedom.

How timely their purpose in this hour of world crisis.

And how appropriate their role in what was once Russian-America and lies within sight of Siberia. Siberia, which to the free world has always signified exile, imprisonment, and death, and never more so than under the tyranny of the Soviet police state.

The Alaskans were and are well qualified to carry out their purpose. They brought with them their traditions of self-government. Imbued with the pioneer spirit, self-reliant, energized by the frontier, hardy in body and independent in spirit, they are the rugged individualists of the type who from earliest days have helped mold America.

Handicapped by 45 years' delay after the treaty before receiving any workable self-government—the longest period of Federal neglect of a Territory in our history—they made the best of the limited form of government given them by the Organic Act of 1912.

A second 45 years have now passed since that first Territorial legislature convened in Juneau in 1913. Its membership of 24—its numbers determined by Congress—was a typical cross-section of an American legislative body of that day. Eighteen of its members were born in the States. The remaining 6 had their birthplaces in 6 countries whose ideas of freedom and self-government are akin to ours—England, Ireland, Canada, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland.

How did they perform? And how have their successors performed in the 22 biennial sessions since then?

In those 45 years the successive Territorial legislatures have gradually set up and now maintain a complete structure of Territorial government. It renders all the services needed in Alaska—the services performed by any State excepting those few which Congress, in the Organic Act of 1912, specifically prohibited.

Before evaluating the present structure of Alaskan government, it might be well to note that those legislators were pioneers in thought as well as in action. They had been elected by male suffrage only. Their first act—Act No. 1 of the First Alaska Legislature—was to enfranchise women. They wasted no time in anticipating by 7 years for Alaska what the 19th amendment would do for the entire Nation.

The forward look has characterized many of Alaska's legislative acts since that time. And what better evidence of political maturity.

The first and second Territorial legislatures provided what was probably the first old-age pension adopted by any legislature, thus anticipating locally, in a token and modest way, the national social security legislation of 20 years later.

Serving well in both world wars—exceeding its quotas both of men in uniform and war bonds—Alaska was the first political entity after World War II to enact veterans' legislation. In a special session called for the purpose early in 1946 the legislature passed an admirable act which enables returning servicemen to reincorporate themselves in civilian life by providing either a cash bonus, dependent on length of service, or a loan to enable them to buy a home, a farm, a fishing boat, or to set up a business. Financed by a temporary sales tax which ceased when a sufficient fund had been collected, the service to Alaska veterans continues through the repayments of principal and interest, and has been extended to Korean war veterans.

Federal and State Governments have been wrestling with the billboard issue, and Congress recently enacted some provisions which still remain to be tested and implemented. Alaska solved that problem 9 years ago by a legislative act banning billboards from all highways.

In anticipation of statehood and gravely concerned about the depletion of the Pacific salmon under Federal bureau management, the 1949 legislature established its own department of fisheries in order to be prepared for the full conservation responsibilities under statehood.

Anticipating the discovery of oil—which took place more than 2 years later—the 1955 legislature enacted far-reaching oil and gas conservation and regulation measures, drawing on the experience of California, Texas, Oklahoma, and other oil-producing States.

Anticipation of problems, rather than attempting to cope with them after they have arisen—the essence of good government—has been a frequent Alaskan legislative characteristic. Nowhere has this been more clearly shown than in the field which Alaskans deem of foremost importance—education.

Alaskans early forestalled the problem of teacher shortage which has troubled nearly every State, by paying its teachers salaries that exceeded those in the States, thereby showing a true appreciation of the men and women to whom they entrusted the training of their children. Each successive Alaska Legislature has increased teachers' wages. Nor is that all. Each school district has the authority to add to the pay provided in the Territorial scale, and often does. The result is that Alaska's public schools rank high.

Alaskans were the first to grasp the great strategic importance of Alaska to the Nation. From the earliest days of his arrival here, in 1933, Alaska's former Delegate, the late Anthony J. Dimond, whom some of the older Members will remember appreciatively, pleaded for Alaska defenses. He pleaded in committee, on the floor, and in the War and Navy Departments. Four years before Pearl Harbor he prophesied in this body that the Japanese would attack without warning. Unfortunately his vision and wisdom were not heeded. Despite his unceasing efforts, Uncle Sam's Military Establishment in Alaska up to 1940 consisted of 1 obsolete infantry post surviving from the gold rush days, as useless in modern warfare as our western forts dating from the Indian wars. Had Tony Dimond's warning been heeded, Alaska would not have been the only American area invaded. Had the Alaskans' counsels on this national issue been accepted by Congress, our people would have been spared the cost and casualties of the Aleutian campaign to expel the Asiatic enemy from our continent.

Finally I should cite as an example of political maturity the recent action of Alaskans to hasten statehood. Impatient at the delay in the fulfillment of treaty and party platform pledges, their 1955 legislature appropriated $300,000 for a convention which would draw up a constitution for the State of Alaska. After a spirited election 55 delegates—the same number that met in Philadelphia in 1787 to draft the Constitution of the United States—met for 75 days at the University of Alaska. There they drafted a constitution which political scientists assert compares favorably with any similar document. The people ratified it at an election in April 1956. At the same election they approved an ordinance authorizing the election of 2 United States Senators and a Representative to go to Washington and knock at the door of Congress for admission. In this procedure they followed the stirring example of Tennessee, whose people, impatient because the first 3 Congresses had not granted them statehood, called a constitutional convention in 1796, elected 2 Senators and sent them to the National Capital to demand Tennessee's admission. A similar procedure was followed next by Michigan, then by Iowa, and by my own State of California. California, even less patient than Tennessee, jumped right over the period of territorial tutelage into statehood. Three other States, Minnesota, Oregon, and Kansas, have followed the same procedure, but none have exhibited the 90-year Job-like patience of Alaska.

Yes, Alaskans are mature. Indeed, they bring far more experience to their

prospective government than was available in many earlier Territories at the time they became States. I am confident they will contribute greatly to our national counsels, bringing first-hand knowledge of a vast and important area, the only terrain under the American flag which extends both into the Arctic and into the Eastern hemisphere.

There remains the question whether Alaska can support statehood. Alaska can.

Alaska's present revenue structure is based principally on an income tax designed on a percentage of the Federal income tax. It thus permits flexibility, the percentage being altered by each legislature according to need. It obviates for the taxpayers the headache of having to figure out two different income tax returns; it makes for ease of checking, since the territorial tax department has access to the Federal returns; it saves thereby collection costs. It is a wonder to me that States which have State income taxes have not adopted Alaska's formula.

Other taxes are a per case tax on salmon based on the value of pack, business license taxes, and a variety of excises on liquor and tobacco as well as a head tax on every adult receiving income in the Territory. There is a 5-percent gas tax earmarked for highways. There is neither a territorial property tax nor a territorial sales tax. These are left to the lesser political units—municipalities and school districts—but they remain as aces in the hole should more revenue be needed to support statehood.

Alaska has no indebtedness. Alaska has no counties and hence no county taxes. Alaska now conducts, as stated previously, all the needed services of government except those which Congress has specifically prohibited. These, which will be added under statehood, and the estimated annual costs of operating them are, in round figures, as follows:

Courts, $2 million; fisheries and wildlife management, $2 million; Governor's office and legislature, $500,000, totaling an additional $4½ million a year.

But against these additional liabilities there are substantial offsets.

Part of the cost of managing the fisheries and wildlife is already being expended by the territorial department of fish and game with a $400,000 annual appropriation.

Approximately $1,500,000 annually will be forthcoming from 70 percent of the net revenues of the Pribilof Islands seal fisheries. This has for 47 years been wholly a Federal operation in which, though an Alaskan resource, Alaska has not shared. The statehood bill properly provides for such sharing.

Fines, fees, and forfeitures of the court system, revenues derived from the State lands, and miscellaneous receipts make up an amount estimated at $500,000 annually.

Last year, Congress, in anticipation of statehood, and in lieu of participation in the Federal reclamation program, awarded Alaska 90 percent of gross receipts from the oil, gas, and coal leases on the public domain. Oil was struck last summer on the Kenai Peninsula, and since then oil leases at the present rate of 25 cents an acre have been filed on 25 million acres, which though only one-fifteenth of Alaska's area and a small part of its potential oil lands, already presents an accrual of approximately $2 million a year. Moreover the filing is continuing.

With the establishment of a second pulp mill—another year-round industry—at Sitka, which will go into operation in 1960, national forest receipts now running to about $150,000 annually, will be doubled.

Alaska was never included in the Federal aid highway program during its first 40 years, from 1916 to 1956. Alaska had to depend on its own revenues and on annual Federal appropriations which were never substantial except during a 5-year period when a few highways required by our defense program were constructed. Alaska was finally included, in 1956, in the old Federal highway aid program, but not in the thruway program, although paying all the new taxes to support it in the States.

However, the formula for Alaska's participation in the old highway aid program was changed to reduce the area on which the allotment was based, to one-third of Alaska's actual area. In return for this considerable reduction Alaska is to be permitted to use the funds for maintenance as well as for new construction. Alaska's matching share will be about $1,500,000, which can be more than met by Alaska's gas tax which now produces $3,500,000 a year or $2,000,000 more than required for Federal matching.

Thus it will be seen that the safely anticipated revenues closely approximate the added costs of statehood. To meet any additional costs, the State of Alaska can, if it wishes, levy a property tax and a sales tax. They supply an ample margin for additional income. But Alaskans' expectations, which I consider warranted, are that the greatly increased development brought about by statehood will substantially augment the existing sources of revenue.

The many positive advantages of granting statehood to Alaska I shall leave to others to develop. I will rest my case for statehood on these three undeniable facts:

First. We have solemnly pledged statehood for Alaska, and good faith at long last requires the fulfillment of the various pledges we have made.

Second. Alaskans have fully demonstrated their capacity for self-government.

Third. Alaska has the revenue and the resources to support statehood.

The time to admit Alaska as the 49th State is here and now.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour or any part thereof.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of great regret to find myself in opposition to the amiable and distinguished gentleman from New York who has so ably presented and expounded the case for statehood here today.

This bill is of vital importance to the future course of this Nation's history. It strikes at the vitals of our constitutional structure.

Essentially, statehood involves the question of what constitutes an equitable apportionment of political power. All governments, good or bad, merely represent different systems for the distribution, the separation, and the execution of power.

The civilian population of Alaska is 160,000. The combined vote of the Republican and Democratic Parties in the last, 1956, election was only 28,266.

This bill would grant to this handful of Alaskan citizens, first, the power to select and be represented by 2 Senators in the United States Senate; second, the power to select and be represented by 1 Member in the House of Representatives; third, the power to select and be represented by 3 electoral voters in the choice of a President.

This grant of power to Alaska is not a newly created power. This sovereign power now rests in the people of the 48 States. Statehood will deprive the people of the 48 States of their present representative power in the House, in the United States Senate, and in the election of a President.

Before making this decision, we ought to ask ourselves:

Does this bill conform to the spirit and the intent of our Constitution?

Will this bill tend to perfect this Union?

Will this bill promote the general welfare of the Nation's people?

Statehood would grant 2 United States Senators to 160,000 people residing in Alaska. They would possess the power of representation for their interests, in the ratio of 1 Senator for each 80,000 people.

Alaska's 2 Senators and its excessive power, for example, would potentially nullify the will of California's 14 million people, of Illinois' 10 million people, of Georgia's 4 million people, and of the voters of each of the other 48 States.

The voters, in Alaska, would have three electoral votes. An average of 1 electoral vote for each 50,000 inhabitants. The people of the 48 States average 1 electoral vote for each 300,000 population.

This is not the effective political equality for each citizen that we believe in.

The framers of our Constitution founded a Republic. They attempted to combine the best features of both, the Federal and National, types of Government.

The powers granted to the Federal Government were limited. Residual sovereign power was reserved to the States and its people. The plan of two Senators for each State Government conformed to the Federal nature of our Union. The Senators were envisioned to act as protectors of States rights against encroachment by the Federal Government. The selection of United States Senators by the State legislatures was coupled with the design of accounta-

bility to the State Governments rather than to the people of the States.

The 17th amendment to our Constitution was ratified on April 8, 1913. This basic change in the mode of the selection of Senators destroyed the rationale for the distribution of two seats to each State. It is interesting to note that no State has been admitted to the Union since the adoption of the 17th amendment.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 65]

Anderson, Mont.	Dies	Morris
Auchincloss	Dingell	Powell
Bass, Tenn.	Dowdy	Rivers
Bentley	Durham	Robeson, Va.
Buckley	Eberharter	Scott, N. C.
Burdick	Engle	Scrivner
Carnahan	Fenton	Sheppard
Celler	Gordon	Shuford
Chiperfield	Gregory	Sieminski
Christopher	Gross	Smith, Kans.
Clark	Gubser	Springer
Coffin	Hays, Ark.	Steed
Colmer	Jenkins	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Kearney	Trimble
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Vinson
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Watts
Dent	LeCompte	Willis
Denton	Lennon	
	Lesinski	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7999), and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 378 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, the Senators, today, are accountable only to their constituents. They are, no longer, responsible for preserving the powers of their States. Their prime interest must lie in expanding national power to satisfy their areas with Federal funds.

The Senate, today, is a second popular legislative body. Its election continues, however, to be based upon the theory of an equality among States of a Federal Republic instead of equality among citizens of a national democracy.

The 12th amendment upheld the right of political parties to require Presidential electors to pledge support for the party's nominee for President. The President, for practical purposes, is a popularly elected President.

He, no longer, exclusively represents the Nation, independent of political pressures.

As the recognized head of a political party, the President is called upon to compromise the national welfare, with sectional and local political practicalities.

The 16th amendment provides a source of unlimited taxing power to our National Government. It has encouraged the assumption of powers wholly beyond the original concept of our Constitution.

There is no measurement of naked political power. However, expenditures and taxes are a fair estimate of the exercise of political power.

The people of this country pay a total tax of more than $100 billion per year. The National Government takes more than 75 percent of this. The remaining 25 percent goes toward the support of our State, local, and school governments.

We have, step by step, evolved from a Federal Republic into a national democracy.

Twenty-five States, with a population of 31 million people, constituting 18 percent of the Nation's population, control 50 votes and have the majority power in our Senate.

This imbalance of political power is a prime factor in our huge Federal bureaucracy, its wastages, and the consequent burdensome Federal taxes. Every question in Congress, and even in the executive department, is tinted with practical politics.

Our Constitution was not shaped for our present form of government. The imbalances of power, the removal of restrictions upon national power, are fatal weaknesses in our present constitutional structure. We function as a national democracy under rules that were designed for a federal republic.

The grant of 2 United States Senators and 3 electoral votes to Alaska's 28,000 voters is repugnant to the proper apportionment of representation in a national democracy. It violates the spirit and intent of our Constitution. It is incompatible with the ideal of political equality for our citizens.

The equitable measurement of representation for a dominant national government is that of representation in proportion to population. It is the only protection of a majority against a preponderant power of a minority.

Statehood by increasing the power of the minority will tend to break down our two-party system. It leads to coalitions based on sectional interests.

Statehood will accentuate the separation between political power and the voting citizens. It encourages legislation by political expediency instead of sound principle.

This bill will not make a more perfect Union of our States. It will not promote the general welfare.

It can only produce future injustices and further weaken the Nation's welfare.

Can the constituents of the individual Members of this House rely upon the Senators and the Representatives of Alaska to protect and advance their interests?

Are we willing, do we have the moral right, to take the basic voting rights away from our constituents and transfer them in an excessive and disproportionate degree, to this small group of citizens?

Mr. Chairman, it is most disturbing to read the incessant flow of slogans and flammatory statements coming from the overzealous advocates of statehood.

"Patriotism," "right to vote," "colonialism," "second-class citizens," "taxation without representation," "the promise of statehood," "discrimination."

These are charges that we hear repeatedly. If true, they would be a reflection upon the integrity and the wisdom of this Congress. Particularly, upon the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I will attempt to shed a little light on these charges.

This publicity emanates from the Alaska and the Hawaii Statehood Commissions. These two public bodies have spent more than $1 million in the last 10 years of taxpayers' funds to lobby this Congress for statehood. They are, by far, the biggest spending lobbies in this country.

The propriety of a Territorial or State government, using vast public funds to publicize and promote a purely political objective, is most questionable.

The election by Alaska of three Tennessee plan Congressmen was not only presumptuous but it is also a brazen attempt to coerce this Congress.

The Alaska Statehood Commission has published this claim:

"In two World Wars and in Korea, they have fought, in number exceeding the national per capita average."

My figures only include World War II inductees. In that war, according to the Library of Congress, there were only 3,482 draftees from Alaska. This is about 50 percent of the ratio of the national contribution to the armed services.

We certainly cannot justify the claims that one segment of our Nation is more brave or more patriotic than any other. This issue is irrelevant to the political question of statehood. Certainly, Alaska should not be denied statehood, despite the poor mathematical showing in World War II.

COLONIALISM

The proponents of statehood advocate statehood claiming that it would avoid the stigma of colonialism.

The question of statehood is solely and wholly a domestic problem. It is an admission of abject weakness to allow foreign opinion to decide the conduct of our internal affairs.

We should not fear to disappoint our foreign enemies. Our friends need no explanations.

PRECEDENT

The advocates of statehood rely upon the use of precedent to lend validity to their claims.

Actually, legislative bodies do not recognize precedent. That is a principle applicable only to the judiciary.

The Tennessee plan for the admission of States originated with the Northwest Ordinance. This ordinance provided for the admission of States upon attaining a population of 60,000 people. But, at that time, the population of the country was only 3,600,000.

When Tennessee was admitted, it had a population of 105,000, or one-fiftieth of the Nation's 5,300,000 people.

According to this ratio, Alaska ought to have a population of over 3 million before it could qualify for statehood.

It is claimed that Alaska has an inchoate status of statehood because of a

pronouncement by the Supreme Court that it is an incorporated Territory.

This is another fictional doctrine of the Supreme Court. The problem of statehood is exclusively a political one. This is another attempted intrusion by the Supreme Court into legislative functions.

GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

The impact of publicity favoring statehood is well illustrated by this recital of the official actions of the governors' conferences.

Resolutions favoring statehood for Alaska and Hawaii were adopted at the annual governors' conferences, successively from 1947 to 1952.

In 1953 a memorandum was sent to each governor of the 48 States indicating the loss of representative power for each State. Since 1952, no resolution has been adopted by the governors' conferences recommending statehood for either Alaska or Hawaii.

PROMISE OF STATEHOOD

The supporters of statehood claim that there has been either an expressed or implied promise of statehood.

Actually, no one could possibly make a valid promise, expressed or implied, on behalf of the Congress and the President. These assertions are merely self-serving wishful delusions.

POLITICAL POWER OF TERRITORIES

Alaska, today, possesses general legislative power to enact laws relating to its property, affairs and government. Its powers are similar to the powers of our sovereign States.

Although Congress has reserved the right to disapprove Territorial legislation no law passed by either Alaska or Hawaii has ever been disapproved by Congress.

There are two differences, both relatively minor, in the functioning of the Alaskan Territorial government and that of our State governments.

The Governor of Alaska is appointed by the President instead of being elected by the people of the Territory.

The regulation of fishing is retained by the Federal Government.

Alaska does not appear to seriously want either an elected Governor nor additional power to regulate its fishing rights.

Alaska has not presented a comprehensive program for additional powers. The proponents of statehood have concentrated upon their drive for power in Congress.

In fact, Alaska is most ably represented by its distinguished Delegate. Most Members of this House are limited to serving on one major standing committee. The distinguished Delegate from Alaska enjoys the unique advantage of membership on four committees, Agriculture, Armed Services, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

No Member of this House has the opportunity of serving on this imposing list of committees.

The record of the distinguished Delegate from Alaska indicates exceptional successful service on behalf of the Territory. His constituents are not second class citizens.

I am positive that any time the people of Alaska decide to seriously present corrective legislation for their exaggerated ills, they will find a sympathetic and receptive committee and Congress.

A small clique of Alaskan residents strenuously claim the right to vote.

Let us examine the complexion of its population:

The civilian population of Alaska is 160,000; this excludes about 55,000 members of the armed services.

There are approximately 20,000 dependents of members of the armed services.

There are 16,000 noncitizen Federal employees and about 16,000 noncitizen dependents of Federal employees.

There are about 20,000 transient and seasonal employees.

The permanent citizen population is less than 90,000 people.

Out of this population, 35,000 are Aleutian, Eskimo and Indian natives. These people do not want statehood.

Certainly, the great influx of its present population was aware of the political status of this Territory.

They certainly cannot claim that their "right to vote" is being unjustly withheld. These recent arrivals are the most vociferous in their drive for political power.

THE ECONOMY OF ALASKA

The advocates of statehood paint a most fanciful picture of the promised land if Alaska is only given statehood.

It is most disheartening to see the political and business leadership of this great land delude themselves and the people with this political panacea.

The development of Alaska is not dependent upon statehood. The wealth of Alaska or of any other land is not contained in her lands or lakes or forests.

The wealth of any land lies in the hearts, the minds, and the muscle of her people.

The drive for statehood is a political diversion that keeps Alaska from seriously examining into the causes of her economic sickness.

The income of Alaska for the year 1956 was distributed as follows:

Mining, income was	$24,000,000
Forestry, income was	34,000,000
Fishing, income was	78,000,000
Farming and miscellaneous	8,000,000
Private-nongovernmental income totaled	144,000,000
Defense and Government spending	356,000,000
Total of all income	500,000,000

Private business totaled less than one-third of her income. More than two-thirds of her income was derived from Government spending.

The Federal Government spent more than $122 million in fiscal 1958 for purely civilian purposes. Military construction amounts to about $100 million a year in addition to the regular defense spending.

This civilian Federal aid and Federal defense spending amounts to $2.50 for every $1 of private-enterprise income.

Alaska is a glaring example of the failure of the welfare state. Its total Federal taxes are only $45 million a year. It receives in Federal nonmilitary handouts about three times what it pays into the Federal Treasury.

It seeks more political power in order to squeeze more Federal feeds out of Washington.

Alaska is long on politics and short on economics. It suffers from both political and economic illnesses. Alaska has an artificial economy. It is a land of scarcity of goods and an overabundance of political oratory.

The political atmosphere in Alaska is hostile to the creation of wealth and job opportunities. It has one of the highest tax rates of any State.

The cost of living in Alaska is fantastically inflated. This is partly caused by unionized monopolistic high wages, and a lack of economic productivity.

There is relatively little savings or profit for capital investment for the creation of productive wealth and jobs.

The labor force in Alaska varies from about 30,000 in the winter to about 50,000 in the summer. About 21,000 of these, or one-half of the peak labor force are union members. Only one-fourth of the labor force in the 48 States are union members.

Of course, the high laboring wages in Alaska are rationalized by the theory that Uncle Sam pays the bill, so the sky is the limit. The citizens of Alaska fail to see that these high wages also retard sound economic development by small business and entrepreneurs who cannot compete with Uncle Sam.

Outside capital refuses to come into Alaska because of its high tax rates, its immature politics, and its hostile radical unionism.

Yes, there is discrimination in Alaska. However, the discrimination is in favor of the Alaskan people and is a discrimination against the taxpayers of the 48 States.

JONES ACT

The Alaskan people have made political capital out of the Jones Act. They claim that they are being discriminated against. They say that there is a monopoly to fix high transportation charges.

Actually, Alaska is in the same position as every other port. Foreign ships cannot carry cargo between United States ports which includes Alaska.

The only exception to this law is that Canadian railroads can be used to ship between two American points, such as Detroit to Seattle. But, Canadian railroads cannot be used to ship between Detroit and Alaska.

Canadian ships do carry cargo to the ports of Hyder, Haines, and Skagway. There are three lines carrying cargo to the ports of Whittier, Seward, and Anchorage. There is plenty of competition for this business.

The Jones Act is not the bugaboo that the Alaskan people would have us believe. I cannot believe that the Merchant Marine Committee would be so unsympathetic that they would not recommend legislation to relieve the people of Alaska if they could present a reasonable case.

Let us examine the mismanagement of Alaska's unemployment compensation laws.

Alaska has the dubious distinction of being the only State or Territory whose unemployment compensation funds are insolvent.

Alaska borrowed $2,630,000 from the Federal Government in January 1957. It borrowed another $2,635,000 in February 1958. It appears almost certain that Alaska will again be forced to borrow another $2 million or $3 million before the end of the year. None of these funds have been repaid as yet. The prospects for repayment are not very promising.

The unemployment payroll deductions are 3 percent. The only other State with that rate is Rhode Island. Alaska also levies 5 percent on employees. Only two other States levy a tax on employees for unemployment compensation.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. This deficit in the unemployment fund, as I understand, amounts to over $5 million.

Mr. PILLION. Yes. As of right now it is over $5 million.

Mr. HOSMER. Would that be an obligation of the new State?

Mr. PILLION. Yes, it would, at the end of about 4 years. But, they will have to borrow again. They are broke now or very close to it. They are down to about a $200,000 reserve.

Mr. HOSMER. That amounts to a pretty fair share of the annual tax collection, then, I take it.

Mr. PILLION. It shows the political way in which they handle unemployment funds, not based on an actuarial basis but a political situation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Albert	Durham	Morris
Arends	Eberharter	Moulder
Ashley	Engle	Powell
Auchincloss	Farbstein	Radwan
Bailey	Fenton	Rains
Barden	Gordon	Rivers
Bass, Tenn.	Gregory	Robeson, Va.
Bentley	Gross	Scott, N. C.
Breeding	Gubser	Scrivner
Buckley	Haskell	Sheppard
Burdick	Hays, Ark.	Shuford
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays, Ohio	Sieminski
Carnahan	Hillings	Siler
Celler	James	Smith, Kans.
Christopher	Jenkins	Spence
Clark	Jensen	Steed
Coffin	Kearney	Trimble
Colmer	Kilburn	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Vursell
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Watts
Dent	LeCompte	Wharton
Dies	Lennon	
Dowdy	Magnuson	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, finding itself without a quorum, he caused the roll to be called, when 352 Members responded to their names, disclosing a quorum to be present, and he submitted herewith a list of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is recognized.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, just previous to this rollcall I had stated that the total payroll deductions for unemployment tax in Alaska amounted to 3 percent from the employers and one-half percent from the employees.

The average payroll deduction in the 48 States is only 1.4 percent.

The average weekly wage in Alaska is $138. Their unemployment compensation benefits range from $45 to $70 per week.

This maximum unemployment benefit of $70 per week is higher than the average weekly wages in 17 of our States.

This is a partial answer to Alaska's high cost of living, the failure to attract business capital, and her other economic and political troubles.

It is claimed by the proponents of statehood that Alaska's economy is depressed by the mismanagement of public lands by the Department of the Interior.

Congress has already passed a law giving Alaska two sections—Nos. 16 and 36—out of each township. Surveys have been made upon 230,000 acres which are now being held in trust for Alaska.

Oil leases are being signed at the rate of 5,000 a year. Alaska is entitled to 90 percent of all royalties which amount to 37½ percent. The backlog here is about 5,000 applications.

The Small Tract Act allows individuals to purchase up to 5 acres at an appraised value of about $10 per acre for the construction of homes. There is no backlog in this program.

There is no holdup or backlog on mining leases. A prospector can file on a location or a mine anywhere.

Any person can homestead 160 acres for himself and 160 acres for his wife, by living there 2 years. There is no backlog in this program.

The Territory of Alaska has never presented any detailed or specific complaints or recommendations for any improvement in the administration of the public lands of Alaska.

Her general, vague, unsupported, unverified charges are merely a diversionary tactic in their battle for the political power of statehood.

Mr. Chairman, statehood for Alaska will not solve the problem of representation in Congress for all of our citizens. It will only open the door to and create a series of additional insoluable situations.

If Alaska with a civilian population of 160,000 is granted statehood, what justification can there be for denying statehood to these other areas:

First. Hawaii with a population of 500,000 citizens where Mr. Bridges and the Communist-controlled ILWU will certainly influence or control the selection of 2 United States Senators and 2 Representatives.

Second. The District of Columbia with 830,000 citizens. If the right to vote is our only test, then how can we deny these people 2 Senators and 3 or 4 Representatives in Congress. The inhabitants, here, are citizens too.

Third. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has 2,500,000 citizens. By the way, this island, I am informed, is a hotbed of communism. What reason do we have to deny these people statehood with 2 United States Senators and 8 to 10 United States Representatives.

Fourth. The Pacific island of Guam has a total citizenship of 65,000. They have their own Territorial legislature. They have repeatedly passed resolutions asking that a Delegate be sent to our Congress.

That is the first demand toward statehood with 2 United States Senators and 1 Representative.

Fifth. The Virgin Islands, with 30,000 citizens, is also seeking a Delegate to our Congress.

If we grant statehood to Alaska, we should also be prepared to met these additional demands. To grant statehood to Alaska and deny statehood to these other citizens will only aggravate our problems, and justly intensify the pressures for statehood and representation in Congress for these other citizens.

Mr. Chairman, Alaska's difficulties are primarily economic, and not political. She must seek to reorient her economy if she wants to cure her ills. Statehood is only a political diversion.

For the 48 States, statehood would be a tragic political misadventure. It is not the proper or the wise solution to this problem.

This bill ought to be recommitted for the good of both the citizens of Alaska and the citizens of the 48 States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice the gentleman referred to Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico as possible new States. Does the gentleman feel that we have made any commitments at all to Alaska and Hawaii relative to statehood?

Mr. PILLION. None whatever; no one can make a commitment on behalf of this Congress or the President.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman recognize that Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower have all recommended statehood for Alaska?

Mr. PILLON. They are all fine gentlemen, but it is rather far afield when the power to grant statehood lies wholly within the House and the Senate, and no one can bind the Members of this Congress in a matter such as that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman. Does the gentleman also realize that both political parties for 12 years at their conventions adopted resolutions in which they favored statehood for Alaska?

Mr. PILLION. It is an unfortunate situation that political platforms are drawn up in the heat of campaigns or just before an election for the purpose, as the gentleman knows, of attracting votes. It would be much better if our political parties drew up their platforms

at a time when they were not seeking votes and could consider these matters objectively and not for the sole purpose of attracting votes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman realize that all Gallup polls taken in the last 10 years have shown overwhelmingly, in all sections of the country, that the people themselves feel that Alaska is entitled to statehood?

Mr. PILLION. Well, unfortunately, the Gallup polls do not always reflect the mature judgment of the people who are polled. I happened to take a poll in my district on the question of whether the people in the district wanted to delay statehood. There were 110,000 questionnaires sent out, and the returns, surprisingly, were 2½ to 1 in favor of delaying statehood until communism was eradicated from Hawaii and there would be no chance of Mr. Bridges and Mr. Foster and Khrushchev having 2 representatives in the United States Senate and 2 in this House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I sent a questionnaire to the Fourth District in Nebraska, also some 80,000. There were some 20 questions on the questionnaire. One of them was, "Do you favor immediate statehood for Alaska?" Seventy-eight percent of the votes returned, a large group of them, said "Yes."

Mr. PILLION. Well, the difference, I think, lies in the fact that year after year I have told the constituents of my district about the Communist situation in Hawaii, what Mr. Bridges has done there, the control he has over the Territorial legislature, and have told them recently of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii extending an offer of a public office to Jack Hall, the convicted Communist lieutenant of Harry Bridges, a key figure in the international Communist conspiracy. And he was tendered a public office by the Republican Governor in the Territory of Hawaii. It indicates the strength, the political influence, of the Communist Party in Hawaii. Of course, after the people know the facts, both sides, you do not find them so eager for statehood; you do not find them voting 4 or 5 to 1 for statehood. Of course, the Hawaii Statehood Commission, as I stated here before, has spent $1 million or more in the past 10 years publicizing only the fine music, the delectation of visitors, the rhythm of the Hawaiian music, all of which is very nice but has nothing to do with the political problem of statehood.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In our report on page 34 in reporting this bill it says:

> The Constitution itself provides that Congress shall decide when and how new States shall be admitted. * * * In a long series of cases, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that an unincorporated Territory is "an inchoate State," the ultimate destiny of which is statehood.

Mr. PILLION. As I stated in my statement here, I feel that the question of statehood is purely a political one, exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Congress, and any pronouncement such as was read by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska is an attempted intrusion on the part of the Supreme Court to tell this Congress what to do and what not to do. And it is time the Supreme Court limited itself to its proper function and not attempt to establish political policy for the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, you and I live in a country where honest and sincere men and women, may, can, and do differ in their thinking, their political thinking.

Mr. PILLION. Surely.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We would not have it any other way.

Mr. PILLION. Naturally.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is natural. And the gentleman made a scholarly address as to his position on Alaska. To me it is almost convincing.

Mr. PILLION. I am sorry about that word "almost."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But I am trying to point out that all the Gallup polls and our Presidents have all recommended statehood. Perhaps they also may be right. At least we ought to give those who support statehood the right to an expression of opinion.

Mr. PILLION. I certainly concede the sincerity of the motives of the persons who favor statehood. I have no quarrel whatever with those persons who do.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he believes in States rights?

Mr. PILLION. Yes; of course.

Mr. SAYLOR. If the gentleman believes in States rights, why does he make such a point of the fact that the unemployment-compensation fund being raised by employers and employees in Alaska is not the same as it is in New York State or in Pennsylvania? That is a matter for the people in Alaska to determine; is it not? What business is it of this Congress?

Mr. PILLION. Will the gentleman permit me to explain that?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. PILLION. It would, of course, not be any of our business if they ran a solvent insurance fund, but when they go broke, when they go bankrupt, and call upon the citizens of the gentleman's State and the citizens of the other States, the taxpayers, to lend them money, which money I do not think will ever be repaid, because repayments do not start for 4 years, and they have a rate at which they pay out the funds and a rate at which they collect the funds, that do not meet, that do not match, that is what makes it different. If we lend them $2½ million each year for the next 4 years, they will owe us $10 million. I can see no prospect of Alaska, under our law, repaying the $10 million. It is just another means by which they receive moneys that they are not entitled to.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on that, because, looking at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I found that the gentleman from New York just a week or so ago voted that his State and other States of the Union could do just what he is complaining about Alaska doing—that is, borrow funds.

Mr. PILLION. They are solvent. That is why they can borrow.

Mr. SAYLOR. If they were solvent, they would not have to call upon the Federal Government for funds, would they?

Mr. PILLION. In fact, New York State has something like $900 million in her unemployment fund.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to ask another question. I know of no Member of this House of Representatives or of the other body in favor of communism, wherever it may be found. But the argument the gentleman just made is that we should not admit Alaska or Hawaii to statehood until communism has been stamped out; is that so?

Mr. PILLION. That is very much so. I think it would be a great tragedy to permit Hawaii to come in and to permit Harry Bridges to select 2 Senators for the Senate and 2 Members for the House.

Mr. SAYLOR. J. Edgar Hoover just made the statement a short time ago that there are more Communists in New York City, and in the State of New York, than in all the rest of the country put together. Is the gentleman in favor of carrying his argument to its logical conclusion, of excluding the State of New York, its 43 Members of this House and 2 United States Senators, from representation in this Congress, until the people of New York stamp out communism?

Mr. PILLION. The number of Communists has no meaning in this problem. It is the power that they wield. If one of them were the head of the security forces in the country, that would be as significant as having 1,000 card-bearing members of the party who did not have the power. There they have the power and they use it. That is the important thing. They are using it in Hawaii to the fullest extent. They consolidated their strength in the labor-union field. They consolidated their strength in the political field, where the ILWU is stronger than either the Republican or the Democratic Party in Hawaii. They control the politics of Hawaii. That is what is important.

Mr. SAYLOR. Am I correct, then, that the House at the present time is considering H. R. 7999, a bill to provide for the admission of Alaska as a State into the Union? Is that the bill that we are considering at the present time?

Mr. PILLION. That is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. Then the gentleman's argument seems to be that because Harry Bridges has some effect, in the gentleman's opinion, in Hawaii, Alaska should not be made a State. I should like to find out the logic of the gentleman's position.

Mr. PILLION. A few years ago, as the gentleman will remember, Hawaii was the Territory that should have statehood. It was the Territory that qualified in every respect, not Alaska. Alaska was in the background. The strategy of the proponents of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii is to let Alaska run interference for Hawaii, so that Alaska can come in. The issue of Communists is not important there. But once Alaska

is in, the stampede will be on to give Hawaii statehood next. If you grant statehood to 160,000 people in Alaska, what justification could there be for denying statehood to 500,000 people in Hawaii?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. The distinguished gentleman from New York who preceded the gentleman made some reference to the so-called shoehorn argument, that Alaska's statehood would act as a shoehorn to achieve Hawaiian statehood. Is that the item to which the gentleman is speaking at this moment?

Mr. PILLION. There is no question about it. Alaska is just running interference for the idea of bringing in Hawaii immediately thereafter.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I was interested in the gentleman's observation that Hawaii would be the next on the list. May I ask the gentleman if he happens to have on his desk a pamphlet similar to the one I have on my desk, which states that Puerto Rico also wants us to consider statehood for it?

Mr. PILLION. Guam and the Virgin Islands—they are all in there. They all want representation in our Congress. Once we go along with statehood for Alaska, following the 17th amendment we have a principle now we can stand on until we can adjust our situation with regard to representation for these peoples. Once we grant statehood for Alaska then, of course, the others will say they, too, are entitled to two Senators in the United States Senate.

Mr. FORRESTER. I did want the gentleman to know I did have that pamphlet, and that Puerto Rico is now figuring to ask for statehood also.

Mr. PILLION. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the gentleman is to be congratulated on his very forthright statement, and I wish to compliment him. I was going to ask the other gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] a question, but perhaps the gentleman now on the floor can answer it. There are many questions that I think should be answered about this specific bill. I hope item by item it will be discussed by members of the committee.

On page 11, at the bottom of the page, subsection (j), and continuing onto page 12, there is indication that any funds that will be used for school purposes shall be prohibited from use for parochial schools. Is that in the gentleman's opinion going to be discriminatory against Catholics or any other people who are religiously and diligently trying to educate the people of this country?

Mr. PILLION. I do not know. I really do not know about that.

Mr. BEAMER. I think it is something that should be answered.

Mr. PILLION. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] perhaps can answer it.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Is the gentleman suggesting that a bill that I am supporting here is written so as to be antagonistic to any religious group?

Mr. BEAMER. I am merely asking the question. I was wondering if it might be so implied. I do not know.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. No. The committee considered the separation of church and state, in which I very firmly believe, and that is in the bill.

Mr. BEAMER. Suppose, then, we have some Federal-aid-to-education proposal as we have had in the past. Are we going to eliminate any parochial schools from such aid which might go to Alaska in the event it becomes a State, or any other present Territory becomes a State? I think we should project that into the future and determine whether or not we are answering all the questions in relation to this particular issue.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will yield, my recollection is that that provision to which the gentleman from Indiana alludes is exactly the same as is found in other enabling bills for States.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I was interested in the gentleman's colloquy with the other gentleman from New York with respect to the Constitution in relation to having so many Senators or less. Because of that, let me ask the gentleman this question:

It is about a matter that is being talked about, that some of the larger States, if this condition is made, that the people there might have to go to the device of dividing their States into two or more States in order to regain their proportion of representation in the other body. Under our Constitution, would it be possible for some of our existing States to divide in order to secure or in order to resecure for themselves representation in the other body to which they are now entitled?

Mr. PILLION. As I understand it, the only State might be Texas, but as a practical proposition it would be a rather difficult situation.

Mr. HOSMER. As I understand it, in about 1860 a resolution was passed by my own State of California to divide into two States and enabling legislation was passed here in the Congress, which I think is still on the books, although the California law was taken off the books some 20 or 25 years later.

Mr. PILLION. I regret to say I am not enough of a constitutional authority to give the gentleman a definite answer.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have asked the gentleman to yield simply to advise the members of the committee that the gentleman from Oklahoma who is now going to address us will take 5 or 10 minutes of time and not more than that, and then it will be the intention of the gentleman from Colorado to move that the Committee rise. I understand there are many Members who have important engagements.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, there are more eyes upon this House today, across the world, than there have been on any matter before us this year.

They are not only the eyes of our American people, who have indicated by every poll on the question that they favor, overwhelmingly, Statehood for Alaska.

They are also the eyes of free men in all parts of the world—who look to see if America still stands for what we stood in 1776.

LET US END COLONIALISM IN ALASKA

No American should ever forget that this Nation of ours was the first colony in history to free itself from colonial rule.

The decision made, our fathers proclaimed to the world the principles which guided them, and us, ever since. These principles include the equality of men, the inalienability of their rights, their consent to be governed. Another principle which had lighted the torch of revolution over a year earlier, was "no taxation without representation." These principles have guided us to national greatness.

Today, we are flouting those basic principles and have been for some time. I refer to Alaska. By the standards our fathers set, and by a long train of other abuses similar to those against which they revolted, Alaska is a colony. This is an unwelcome, hardly credible fact. Today, we have the opportunity to rectify it by giving to Alaska—as we have 35 times to other areas since our Union was founded—the equality of Statehood, and government by consent, and representation in their taxation. Unless we do this, the taxation Alaskans have borne for 45 years will continue to be taxation without representation, which our pioneering forefathers correctly identified as tyranny.

There are various ways of defining a colony. We can draw such a definition from our own colonial experience. A colony is a dependent area in which the important political decisions are made somewhere else. When those decisions also adversely affect the colony's inhabitants—especially if for the benefit of residents of the superior or colonial power—then the latter is guilty of colonialism. The use of political power to create economic advantage for nonresidents of the colony is the quintessence of colonialism. That is happening in Alaska today.

Forty-two years ago Congress passed the Federal-Aid Highway Act—a highly important and beneficial piece of legislation. Alaska was excluded from it—except in the national forests—although Hawaii and even Puerto Rico—which pays no Federal taxes whatever—were included. Instead, Alaska got an occasional, wholly inadequate handout, in annual special appropriations, which were appreciable for only a few years, when national defense required them.

Congressmen with votes deliberately excluded Alaska—which had no vote—from participation. Even in the case of the national forest highways, the Congress, for some years, reduced Alaska's share under the established formula, depriving Alaska of some $7 million—which was not returned to the Federal Treasury but divided among the States with national forests, whose Congressmen had the votes to switch this sum to their States. Every Alaskan was shortchanged thereby for the benefit of stateside constituencies. This was a plain and unvarnished act of colonialism.

Another more recent example: The Interstate Highway bill, enacted in 1956, contained some new and additional taxes on trucks, trailers, tires, and gas. Alaska was excluded from the benefits of this great supplementary highway program, but included in the taxation, despite the wholly reasonable plea of Alaska's voteless Delegate, that Alaska should be either included in both, or excluded from both. Today, in consequence, whenever an Alaskan goes to his gas station and says, "Fill 'er up," he is paying a cent a gallon to build the superhighways in every State of the Union from Alabama to Wyoming, but not in Alaska. That is colonialism.

Under the same act, he is paying an additional 3 cents a pound on tires—likewise for throughways not in Alaska. There is a striking analogy between that 3 cents a pound on tires that Alaskans must pay, and the 3-pence-a-pound tax on tea which caused our colonial forefathers to dump it into Boston Harbor. It was colonialism then in the Thirteen Colonies. It is colonialism now in the Alaska colony. Alaska has since been included in the old Federal Aid Highway Act, though on a reduced formula. But the years of Alaska's exclusion from participation have left it with a negligible highway system—3,500 miles, in an area one-fifth as large as the 48 States.

Thirty-eight years ago, Congress passed what is officially known as the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. In Alaska, it is known as the Jones Act, after its sponsor, the late Senator Wesley L. Jones, of the State of Washington. The act continued for shippers of freight across the country and the oceans beyond, the beneficial alternative for use of either domestic or foreign carriers—foreign meaning principally Canadian. But in section 27 of the act were inserted the words "excluding Alaska," which meant that of all areas—foreign and domestic—Alaskan consignors or consignees of shipments were denied the benefits of these provisions. The purpose of this discriminatory language was to benefit, instead, some of Senator Jones' constituents engaged in the shipping, transfer, and wharfage business in his home city of Seattle. This it did, but at the expense—the heavy expense—of Alaskans. Budding Alaskan enterprises, which had been shipping their manufactures through the port of Vancouver and over Canadian railways, were compelled by the act to ship through Seattle, tripling their costs and putting them out of business.

Subject ever since to the Seattle steamship monopoly, with rates specially high for Alaska only, in the transfer charges from railway to dock, for wharfage, and then for ocean freight to and from the Alaskan community of origin or destination, Alaska's cost of living has soared, until it is the highest under the flag. If anyone questions that this imposition by Congressional Act was not a flagrant example of colonialism, let him wait a moment to hear that fact judicially confirmed.

For the Alaska Territorial Legislature, meeting the following year, and highly indignant at this discrimination, ordered the Territorial attorney general to take the matter to court. The legislators believed that the discriminatory language of the Jones Act was a violation of the commerce clause in the Constitution, which, in section 9, limits the powers of Congress, and in the sixth paragraph declares:

> No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another.

Ultimately, the case came before the United States Court. Alaska's attorney general argued that the Jones Act had deprived Alaskans of the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, guaranteed them by the treaty of cession with Russia, and that furthermore, the Constitution had been specifically extended to Alaska in section 3 of the Organic Act of 1912. To Alaskans, it looked as if Senator Jones had overreached himself in his desire to benefit his constituents at the expense of Alaskans, and they waited, with hopeful confidence, that the highest Court in the land would do them justice.

The case for the Government and against Alaska was presented by the Solicitor General of the United States, a distinguished Philadelphia lawyer, James M. Beck. Let us note well the words of his concluding argument:

> If the Fathers had anticipated the control of the United States over the far-distant Philippine Islands, would they, whose concern was the reserved rights of the States, have considered for a moment, a project that any special privilege which the interests of the United States might require for the ports of entry of the several States should by compulsion be extended to the ports of the colonial dependencies.

What the United States Department of Justice was arguing was that any special privilege which the interests of the United States might require, should prevail over any rights claimed for the people of a colonial dependency. The colonial dependency in this case was Alaska. Colonialism could not have been avowed more frankly than it was by the executive branch of the Federal Government, defending the action of the legislative branch before the judicial branch.

And the Supreme Court agreed with that view. Mr. Justice McReynolds, rendering the opinion for the Court, said, "the act does give preference to ports of the States over those of the Territory," but that the Court could "find nothing in the Constitution itself or its history which impels the conclusion that it was intended to deprive Congress of the power so to act"—*Alaska* v. *Troy* (358 U. S. 101, February 27, 1922).

So the highest Court of the land, now housed in a beautiful edifice, over whose portals is deeply chiseled in marble the legend "Equal Justice Under Law," decided that it is legal and constitutional to discriminate against a Territory. Can anyone, any longer, assert that justice is equal for the residents of the colonial dependency, Alaska? Do we need still further proof that Alaska is a colony, and its inhabitants victims of colonialism?

For 38 years, ever since the passage of the Jones Act, Alaska's voteless Delegates have introduced bills to remove from it the discriminatory words "excluding Alaska." In vain. Those interests that enjoy the "special privilege," to which the Solicitor General of the United States made reference, have the votes to retain it. It has cost—and continues to cost—the people of Alaska millions of dollars annually for the benefit of these vested interests in Seattle, who had the political power to write this discrimination into the law, and the political power to keep it there. That is colonialism, as crude—if not cruder—than any against which our forefathers poured out their blood and treasure.

But that still is not all. The astronomical Alaskan costs of living are further raised by another manmade, stateside discrimination of long standing. We have seen colonialism at work to the disadvantage of the colonials in the Alaska dependency in two important fields of transportation—highways and steamships. We shall now see it in a third field—railways.

About half a century ago, the railways of the United States started developing so-called export-import tariffs, by which the rail part of the haul for overseas shipments was reduced. The areas to which these beneficial, lower rates were extended, were gradually increased until they included every country bordering on the Pacific Ocean, except Alaska. Thus, the tariff on the rail haul from any point in the United States to the port of exit, Seattle, is substantially higher—sometimes over 100 percent—if the tag on the shipment indicates that its ultimate destination is in Alaska. For the same article, originating in the same factory, shipped in the same way, even in the same car—in other words, for the identical service—the charge to Alaskans is higher than if the tag shows the shipment is destined for Hawaii, Japan, Australia, the West Coast of Mexico, Central or South America, or even Communist China. Alaskans began, 10 years ago, to protest to the railroads against this exclusive discrimination. They got nowhere. Five years ago, they were encouraged by enlisting the support of the General Services Administration. Its concern was aroused not so much for Alaskans in general, but because the Federal Government itself was being charged the higher rate on supplies and materials destined for the military bases in Alaska. The General Services Administration was likewise unable to per-

suade the railroads to give Alaska the same treatment accorded all other areas in the Pacific. The General Services Administration then started a formal proceeding before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Docket No. 31755, entitled "United States of America against Great Northern Railway Company et al."—the "al" being nearly all the other railways—was decided last June 6. It need surprise no one that it was decided adversely to Alaska.

So again we have a situation where interests in the United States—in this case, the railways—levy discriminatory rates against the residents of the colonial dependency Alaska.

Statehood would put an end to the discrimination in the Jones Act. That much is implicit in the Supreme Court's decision. It might not automatically secure for Alaska the export-import tariffs enjoyed by every other area in the Pacific. But give to the new State of Alaska an Alaska Congressional Delegation, with votes, and all of us know that discrimination would not long endure.

Surveys by the U. S. Civil Service Commission, made public last January, show that the cost of living was 41.7 percent higher in Juneau than in Washington, 56.7 percent higher in Anchorage, and 66 percent higher in Fairbanks. These figures are already obsolete, for since they were issued the Seattle Steamship monopoly has demanded—and secured, over the protests of Alaskans—another 15 percent increase in freight rates.

These are only a few of the instances of colonialism visited on Alaska.

Another flagrant example is in the salmon fisheries, once Alaska's greatest natural resource, and the Nation's greatest fishery resource. Alaska was the one and only Territory denied the right to manage its fisheries and wildlife. The canned salmon industry, headquartered in the Puget Sound area, has fought every Alaska attempt to increase the limited amount of self-government afforded by the Organic Act of 1912. They were sufficiently influential to keep the control of the fisheries in a Federal bureau—where they wanted it. For 45 years, ever since their first legislature, Alaskans have pleaded with Congress to transfer the fisheries to Territorial control and to prevent thereby the depletion which they foresaw and which has now taken place, with tragic consequences for the Alaskan fishermen, and the Alaskan public generally. From a high of over 8 million cases in the middle 1930's, the pack has dropped to less than 3 million cases in each of the last 3 years. So serious was the decline, that the Eisenhower administration felt obliged—for 3 successive years—to declare the fishing communities to be disaster areas.

The Alaskans' principal grievance is directed against a device—the fish trap—a large structure anchored in the path of the salmon, which catches them in large quantities—too large for conservation. The fish traps have been abolished in the other Pacific salmon areas, British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon, where the people control the resource. The fish-trap ownership is concentrated chiefly in a few absentee companies. The 23 successive legislatures, memorials, directed at Congress, have requested the abolition of the traps. Bills introduced in each Congress by Alaska's voteless Delegate, have made the same request. Finally, in a desperate effort to be heard, the people of Alaska, on a referendum in 1948, voted 19,712 to 2,624—a ratio of over 7 to 1—for trap abolition. All of this was in vain, however, and there has been no Congressional action.

The Federal agency supposed to regulate the salmon fishery—for the last 18 years the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior—despite its manifest failure to check the steady decline in the resource and carry out its prescribed conservation function, does not object to retention of the traps. Thus, in a conflict between the few stateside fish-trap beneficiaries, and virtually the entire population of Alaska, the Federal agency throws its full weight and authority on the side of the special privilege in the colonial power, and overrides the far greater interest of Alaskans. That is colonialism. But let no one doubt that the entire American people are not also the victims in the loss of tax revenue, in the cost of disaster relief, and in the destruction of a once great national resource.

These are by no means all of the examples of colonialism which have hampered the development of Alaska, and which should have long since have been ended. It would take hours to relate them all.

Is it not regrettable that at a time when colonialism is agitating the world as never before in its history, and is so clearly on its way out—except within the orbit of Russian imperialism—the United States has missed this great opportunity to be true to its traditions and give mankind a clear example, by action, of what our Nation has so long stood for?

Is it not a paradox that while we have failed to take this obvious course, Great Britain appears to have appreciated the world tide, and has been rapidly granting her form of self-government to her former colonies? Consider the list of new governments which have been granted independence either within or without the British Commonwealth: India, in 1947, Pakistan and Burma in 1948, Ceylon in 1955, and Sudan in 1956, Ghana and Malaya in 1957, and the West Indies Federation in 1958.

It is high time that we Americans put an emphatic and decisive stop to colonialism—which we now practice in unfair and oppressive form against the pioneering Americans of Alaska—and provide by action here for admission of Alaska as our 49th State.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has founded his remarks on the idea of colonialism. Of course, we have Puerto Rico and something over 2 million people as opposed to some 80,000 in Alaska. I would like to know if the gentleman proposes to give statehood to Puerto Rico, to the Virgin Islands, to Hawaii, to Guam, and to any other outlying Territories on the ground that otherwise we are guilty of what the gentleman thinks is such a terrible thing as colonialism.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I will say to my good friend that I do not think we can establish in the case of these other areas a case for colonialism that is clearly established in our treatment of Alaska. I do not believe, until you have that kind of case established, that you can make a case for justice and equity in these other places as you can in Alaska.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Would the gentleman not agree that at least 70 percent of the people in Puerto Rico do not want statehood; that if we are discussing colonialism in relative terms, they have more self-government than the incorporated Territory of Alaska because they elect their own governor and they keep their own taxes? Alaska, which is an incorporated Territory, the highest status next to statehood, has less self-government than Puerto Rico.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has made a very nice speech, particularly to readjust these freight rates. But I think he has been in something of a semantic shuffle on the matter of colonialism. I would not like to see this record go with that unchallenged. Colonialism as it is known as a word throughout the world today is something entirely different from the situation that we have in Alaska. It is the domination by one nation of a people of a different land, of supposedly a lesser economic and social development. The gentleman relates this to the people of the United States who rebelled in 1776 and if he does, he relates it to something that was entirely different, because it was 151 years before 1776 that the people came to this continent and started the creation of a new and separate culture, government, and environment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with my friend, and I do not yield further, for a speech.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Can the gentleman tell us how much tonnage would be shipped to Alaska that is not being shipped now because of the Jones Act discrimination?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have no information on that point. I can only presume, in answer to that question, that if freight rates were lower there would be an increase in freight shipments to that area.

Mr. PILLION. Freight rates, of course, do not enter into this. As far as the bill eliminating the Jones Act discrimination is concerned, to which the

gentleman referred, is there any idea how much would be shipped up to Alaska?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am sorry I cannot supply that information to the gentleman, but I think it is a fair assumption that a lowering of freight rates would bring about greater business interests in that area, greater population, and greater traffic in freight.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7999) to provide for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1342. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Harvey;

H. R. 1466. An act for the relief of Dr. Thomas B. Meade;

H. R. 2763. An act for the relief of Hong-to Dew;

H. R. 4215. An act amending sections 22 and 24 of the Organic Act of Guam;

H. R. 4445. An act for the relief of the estate of Mr. Shirley B. Stebbins;

H. R. 6176. An act for the relief of Fouad George Baroody;

H. R. 6528. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lyman C. Murphey;

H. R. 6731. An act for the relief of Harry Slatkin;

H. R. 7203. An act for the relief of Dwight J. Brohard;

H. R. 7645. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations contained in instrument conveying certain land by the United States to the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 8039. An act for the relief of Edward L. Munroe;

H. R. 8071. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey an easement over certain property of the United States located in Princess Anne County, Va., known as the Fort Story Military Reservation, to the Norfolk Southern Railway Co. in exchange for other lands and easements of said company;

H. R. 8433. An act for the relief of Capt. Laurence D. Talbot (retired);

H. R. 8448. An act for the relief of Willie C. Williams;

H. R. 9012. An act for the relief of Alexander Grossman;

H. R. 9109. An act for the relief of John A. Tierney;

H. R. 9362. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Post 924, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States;

H. R. 9395. An act for the relief of Cornelia V. Lane;

H. R. 9490. An act for the relief of Sidney A. Coven;

H. R. 9514. An act for the relief of Valleydale Packers, Inc.;

H. R. 9738. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., a parcel of land in the said city of Macon containing 5.39 acres, more or less;

H. R. 9775. An act for the relief of William J. McGarry;

H. R. 9991. An act for the relief of Felix Garcia;

H. R. 9992. An act for the relief of James R. Martin and others;

H. J. Res. 586. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of the week beginning on October 13, 1958, as National Olympic Week;

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 232, 84th Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution auorizing the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What is it? How Does It Function?"

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5836) entitled "An act to readjust postal rates and to establish a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes."

POSTAL RATE READJUSTMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5836) to readjust postal rates and to establish a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader if it his purpose to call up this conference report tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. The conference report will be the first order of business tomorrow, and thereafter the consideration of the Alaska statehood bill will continue.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight, May 21, to file a report on the bill H. R. 12591, including, of course, supplemental views.

Mr. MARTIN. Is the gentleman also incorporating in his request provision for a minority report?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; all supplemental views, including minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASTRONAUTICS AND SPACE EXPLORATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration may have until midnight Saturday to file a unanimous report on H. R. 12575, a bill to provide for research into problems of flight within and outside of the earth's atmosphere, and for other purposes; in other words, the so-called outer space agency that will be established.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LIBERALIZING OUR SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, in the past 6 years, on numerous occasions I have spoken on the floor of this House to urge that we liberalize and humanize our social security system.

During my three terms in Congress, I have introduced and spoken in support of a number of my bills which would:

First. Lower the retirement age to 60 for men and 55 for women.

Second. Eliminate the age limit for total and permanent disability benefits.

Third. Strike out the "work clause" for persons over 65.

Fourth. Increase the minimum monthly benefits.

Fifth. Provide a 10 percent increase in all benefits.

Sixth. Eliminate the penalty for women who retire at age 62; and other corrective and necessary measures.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again speak in behalf of my bill, H. R. 2865, which was reintroduced January 1957. Briefly, it will provide full social security benefits to men at age 60 and women at age 55. I am convinced that the task at hand is to improve and alleviate the condition of many of our senior citizens who, because of factors beyond their control, are unable to work or find employment. My bill is an important means to this good end.

As I have stated on prior occasions the purpose of our social security system is to further the social, economic, and psychological well-being of the people in such a way that consideration is given to their individual capacities and their basic needs. It is becoming continually more apparent that our present retirement age requirements intensify the social problems of thousands of neglected, needy persons in this country.

The objectives of my proposal do not present a radical change in the primary purpose of the Social Security Act. But, I believe, the legislation would give the system the ability to be more responsive to the widely differing needs of older workers in our country. Moreover, with a lower retirement age many of our younger people, among the 5 million unemployed, will have an opportunity for work that is not presently within their grasp.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe for 1 minute that there would be mass retirement of employed workers in response to my legislation. It is difficult to imagine that a healthy and happily employed worker of 60 will leave his job for a chance to collect a monthly re-

tirement check of $60 or $80 or even the maximum benefit of $108.50. The incentive to do this is simply not there. It is a fact that those who work and can work remain on the job far beyond the minimum retirement age. And the great majority of those who do retire, do not do so by choice but because of poor health, family decisions and other reasons. A small 5 percent retire voluntarily while they are in good health to take advantage of the benefits they are offered.

I am aware of the fact that this proposal will cost money. But, at a time when we badly need an increase in consumer purchasing power, it would seem to be the best kind of economic, as well as humanitarian policy, to put this money into the hands of people who will spend it immediately for the necessities of life.

Undoubtedly the enactment of this legislation will call for some adjustment in the social security tax schedules, but I believe that the workers of this country will be willing to make these increased contributions with the knowledge that this is a form of investment in their own future protection.

Mr. Speaker, since 1953 when I first came to Congress, I am happy to say, we have made much progress in improving and liberalizing the social security system. In 1956, we eradicated for all time the bugaboo—that 65 is the only age of retirement—which had hamstrung the system since it was established back in 1935. The action of the House of Representatives in reducing the eligibility age for women to 62 was a first step in a realistic retirement policy.

Mr. Speaker, although many inequities were created by granting actuarially reduced benefits to women workers and wives, and full benefits to widows, one good thing resulted—the days when our retirement-age figures have gone unquestioned—and age 65 remains inviolate—were ended. The response of the American people to the reduction of the retirement age, and the institution of disability benefits brought about by the 1956 amendments, shows that they know that retirement is not linked to any traditional age but depends, in large part, upon the vicissitudes of life.

Mr. Speaker, although the artificial age barriers to employment are no measure of an individual's ability to work, it has been shown conclusively that many of our older citizens are too old to be employed but much too young to be eligible for social-security benefits. I believe that this is a situation which we cannot tolerate here in the United States. The basic problem of the present is to see to it that the disadvantaged of this country obtain their share of America's abundance, a larger freedom from insecurity, and a better cushion against job discrimination because of age.

It is my firm belief that the American people want this Congress to act favorably on this legislation. My bill will enable us to take another step forward in our social security system—a system which is based on the principle that contributions throughout working life shall provide the kind of retirement income which preserves dignity and individual security for the deserving citizens of the United States. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will give thoughtful and favorable consideration to this bill now. By doing so, we will alleviate many hardships in millions of American homes.

THE NEED FOR AN EXPANDED PROGRAM FOR FORESTRY RESEARCH

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which is designed to expand our present program of research in forestry and forest products, and for other purposes. This bill is declaratory of the present policy of the Congress to promote the efficient production, marketing, and utilization of the products of the forest. For the attainment of this policy, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to conduct and to stimulate research in the development, conservation, and management of forests and the production, marketing, and utilization of forest products in their broadest aspects.

To implement this Congressional policy the Secretary of Agriculture by the terms of this bill is authorized to cooperate and enter into contracts with colleges, school and universities and with other public and private organizations and individuals. Any contracts or agreements made pursuant to this authority shall contain requirements making the results of research and investigation available to the public through dedication, assignment to the Government, or such other means as the Secretary may determine. In entering into such contracts or in making cooperative arrangements the Secretary may arrange for the utilization of graduate students in the research performed under such contracts or agreements and shall take such measures as he deems appropriate to stimulate interest by graduate students in the development and application of all phases of forestry and forest products utilization research.

In carrying out the intent and spirit of this bill, the Secretary shall emphasize to the extent practicable special and early attention to the development of new uses and products for low-value timber, wood residues, and other products, in the improvement and more efficient production, harvesting, processing, marketing, and use of timber, lumber, and other wood products, and the development of new and improved scientific and technical methods and equipment for the development, conservation, and management of forests and for producing, marketing, and utilizing forest products. The emphasis on expanded forestry research programs is well placed. Forestry is not a short-time proposition. Where this Nation stands in timber supploy at the end of the century depends largely on actions taken during the next two decades. Rapid acceleration of recent encouraging forestry trends is vital if the timber resources of the Nation are to be reasonably abundant 50 years hence. Because of the magnitude of potential demand, and the difficulty of extending more intensive forestry to the millions of small holdings, time is important. The potential of the land is adequate. Our challenge is to make better use of it soon.

My study reveals that the greatest need for research in forestry not now being met is for basic or fundamental work. Progress in the solution of the many problems facing our forestry today depends on constantly increasing knowledge obtained by research and experience. I am happy to report that a very considerable amount of research, especially applied research, is now being done by the Federal and State governments, and by private and industrial interests. However, because of the pressure exerted on these organizations for immediate results having direct practical application in the management of forest properties are in the harvesting and utilization of the timber crop, they can be expected to do little research of a really basic nature. If this sorely needed basic research is done, it will have to be performed by educational institutions, especially private colleges and universities, and the more forward looking private interests, through outright grants, fellowships, and particularly research assistanceships.

It is reassuring to note that for the first time in many years, our forests are growing more wood than we are using. Annual wood growth is increasing at an accelerated rate. Our commercial forest area is expanding. The practice of good forestry on private forest lands—farm, industrial, and other—is spreading rapidly. Some of the most intensive forest management is on the lands of wood-using industries and other private owners.

These facts, bright as they are, do not necessarily mean we shall have more wood than we can use in the years ahead. Our population is growing; our consumption of wood is increasing. Industry and government estimates indicate we will use wood in an increasing rate in the years to come. To keep forest growths ahead of our timber needs is our forestry job today. Many of us fail to realize the significant role our forests play in our economy from day to day. Like so many things, we have taken our great forest resources for granted. In my own State of Missouri, the forests have always played an important part in the economy of Missouri. The half of the population living in cities is not as acutely aware of their dependence on timber crops as are those living on farms and in small communities, but they nonetheless affected by the condition and productivity of the forests and forest industries. A recent survey published by the United States Department of Commerce shows that 3 out of every 100 persons employed in the industries, trades, and businesses of Missouri were employed in industries directly dependent on timber for their raw material. Add to that figure the dependents of those so employed, and the

relation of the forests to the State's welfare becomes apparent. These statistics when multiplied by 48 give us a better understanding of the importance of our forests to our overall economy.

Fundamental research is essential in determining the basic facts and principles upon which forest management and the utilization of forest products depend. Research of this type is basically of general application and as such is a matter for public participation. Federal forest research has placed greater emphasis on forest inventory, forest protection, the economic aspects of forest management, and the utilization of forest products. This should be done through a reorientation program and not through increased appropriations. State and private agencies should be encouraged to expand their programs of forest research. Better coordination to avoid competition and duplication between Federal, State, and private agencies should be effected through the establishment of a National Forest Research Advisory Council representative of private, State, and Federal organizations interested in forest research. The results of research investigations and studies of forest management and utilization should be readily available and currently disseminated to all public and private forest agencies, and the forest industries and landowners. The bill which I have introduced today is a step in the right direction. To provide for the needs of the future we must plan and think in terms of the needs of the future. This can only be accomplished by a properly programed plan for the future.

Starting almost from scratch at the beginning of this century, American forestry has made remarkable advances in the past 50 years. What men of vision half a century ago saw in the years ahead fell far short of what actually came to pass. They failed to fully foresee the astounding developments that have taken place in science, agriculture, and industry. They could not know that a half century would bring two world wars. All of these things made their impact on the forests and on the course of forestry. Forestry, then, should go steadily forward. Its potentialities for contributing to national prosperity, security, and progress are very great. Fifty years from now, as today, the strength of the Nation, will lie in its people and in its resources.

SAFETY IN THE AIR

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic aircraft accident involving a civilian plane and a National Guard jet in the Washington area yesterday, the second of its kind in a short period of time, most forcibly emphasizes the need for Congressional action designed to minimize and possibly eliminate these terrible accidents.

While it is true that Congress has given considerable attention in the past to the general problem of regulating air traffic, both military and civilian, the occurrence of these accidents appears to indicate that final solutions must be found at the earliest possible moment.

The problems involved here are not easy of solution since they concern military as well as civilian aviation. Due consideration must be given, to be sure, to both of these branches of our great aviation system. Obviously, security considerations and the farflung operations of military aircraft must be kept in our minds, but it is also true that the safety of civilian aircraft and their passengers must be safeguarded.

I hope and urge that the various Congressional committees having jurisdiction over air traffic in these respective fields will be prompted by these recent accidents to take immediate action in order to provide a definite, workable system under which air traffic can be effectively regulated in the interest of the national security and public safety.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, another air tragedy occurred yesterday which again emphasizes the compelling need for immediate action to place authority and responsibility in someone to coordinate the use of air space by civil and military aircraft.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, another airliner bashed out of the skies by a military jet—12 dead. Only last month a similar mishap in Nevada killed 49.

Therefore, I have today introduced legislation to establish an independent aviation agency with complete jurisdiction over the flight of all types of aircraft.

This is no hastily conceived proposal. It is based on extensive hearings on air safety by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is a step urged by leading experts in aviation.

Recent tragic midair collisions dramatically underscore the need for this legislation.

As the committee pointed out in its report to the House on its investigation of the Grand Canyon accident 2 years ago, the old "see and be seen" principle of preventing midair collisions is out of date in this jet age of high-speed, high-altitude flight.

Regulations and procedures were tightened following the committee's investigation of the Grand Canyon accident and subsequent mid-air collisions. Amazing progress has been made in modernizing our civil airways for the jet age.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as the legislative committee concerned with the policy considerations involved in this problem, has, over a period of years, given a great amount of attention to various aspects of the air safety problem. It was primarily through the efforts of our committee that the military and civil officials of the Government were induced to reconcile the two different systems of air navigation being pursued separately—TACAN, VOR/DME—and that is now being accomplished—see House Report No. 592, 84th Congress, 1st session. However, there still exists a need for unified control of airspace use and for further coordination of air navigation and traffic control responsibilities in the executive branch of the Government. The committee, in January of 1957, submitted a report to the House—House Report No. 2972, 84th Congress, 2d session—pointing out that new equipment and new concepts of air traffic control must be adopted to meet existing and future problems.

In addition, the Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee of the House, under the able chairmanship of the Honorable PRINCE PRESTON, has recognized the serious nature of this problem, and fully supported the increased budget requests by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for funds to speed up the improvement of existing airways. In its most recent report on this subject that committee said:

> The ultimate objective should be the creation of one civil aviation agency with complete jurisdiction over the use of airspace by all types of aircraft.

Again, in the 85th Congress a further report on airspace use problems—House Report No. 1272, 85th Congress, 1st session—was submitted by the Commerce Committee, pointing up the relationship of airspace use problems to the continued safe and orderly development of civil aviation. In this report the attention of the House was called to the Curtis recommendation for an independent Federal Aviation Agency, as an ultimate requirement, and to his interim recommendation for an Airways Modernization Board.

The need for action now was pointed out in the report submitted by the Civil Aeronautics Board Monday in which 971 valid near-miss reports for 1957 were discussed.

The airspace over the United States is one of our great natural resources. Civil and military aviation must share that airspace. Because of divided authority between civilian agencies and the military, there has been a lack of coordination on the allocation of airspace.

As the CAB pointed out in its report, every day 200,000 or more persons fly safely through the airspace over the United States. They are entitled to the maximum protection that can be provided. The hazards resulting from essential operation of military aircraft must be reduced to the minimum.

I am confident that new procedures and rules of the air can be worked out to reduce those hazards. What we need to do is create an agency to control our airspace and give that agency the personnel and the tools to get the job done.

Dispersion of authority and responsibility has been one of our great problems. Efforts to solve traffic-control problems have been delayed or bogged

down in a labyrinth of Federal agencies. The situation has been one ideal for buckpassing and confusion.

And all this time we have been depending on the airplane to defend our country and to play a role of growing importance in the national transportation system.

At the time of our hearings on the proposal to create an interim Airways Modernization Board—Public Law 85–133—I expressed a desire to hold hearings on this proposed permanent aviation agency this year; however, in view of the anticipated report from the executive branch, on January 15, 1959, we had deferred taking up this matter to allow the executive branch to complete its study and come forward with a detailed legislative recommendation. Recent events make it perfectly clear that we can no longer wait for this recommendation, although I do believe that sufficient time and progress has been made by the executive branch so that they can indicate their specific recommendations on this problem.

There has been plenty of study of the problem. On December 31, 1955, William B. Harding submitted his report to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, recommending that a study of aviation facilities requirements be made to provide for more efficient use of national airspace, integrate civil and military expenditures for aviation facilities and to determine what kind of Government organization is required to control use of the airspace. Subsequently, the President appointed Edward P. Curtis as Special Assistant for Aviation Facilities Planning and directed him to make such a study which was completed on May 10, 1957, and submitted to the President.

The report contained recommendations for meeting the Nation's requirement for aviation facilities and presented an organizational program.

The Curtis report came to the following conclusions:

First. Airways operations and control must be modernized through a comprehensive and continuous research and development program.

Second. The program must be implemented with a Government organization geared to meet the modern-day requirements of both civil and military aviation.

Third. Such a Government organization should include the following:

(a) An Airways Modernization Board to handle the research and development aspects of the problem—this was accomplished by Public Law 85–133, which became effective on August 14, 1957.

(b) The appointment of a special assistant to the President on aviation matters until a permanent organization can be created. This was accomplished on June 14, 1957, by the appointment of Elwood P. Quesada.

(c) The establishment of an independent Federal Aviation Agency into which are consolidated all of the essential management functions necessary to support the common needs of the military and civilian aviation of the United States.

The principal functions of the Federal Aviation Agency would be the following:

First. Development of long-range airspace programs, national airspace policy and the assignment of all United States airspace.

Second. Establishment and operation of the air navigation and traffic control system of the United States.

Third. The research and development functions temporarily assigned to the Airways Modernization Board.

Fourth. The prescription and revision of all air safety regulations.

Fifth. Investigation of air accidents, including military aircraft involving civil damage.

Specifically, this bill would amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to do the following things:

First. Establish an independent Federal Aviation Agency headed by a civilian Federal aviation administrator. The CAA, which is now part of the Department of Commerce, would become the nucleus of the new Federal Aviation Agency.

Second. The functions of the Airways Modernization Board would be transferred to the new Agency.

Third. The authority to prescribe civil air regulations and air-traffic rules would be transferred from the CAB to the new agency; however, appeal to CAB would be provided from proposed rules which would, in the opinion of users of the airways, impose undue burdens on them.

Fourth. The responsibility for the allocation of United States airspace would be vested in the Administrator.

Fifth. Provision is made in the bill for staffing the new Agency with civilian personnel, but calling for appropriate liaison with the military in order to accommodate national defense requirements. The Administrator is authorized to establish such military advisory groups as he may deem necessary in this connection.

Sixth. The Administrator would have the authority to disapprove the location of military, civil and joint civil-military airports as well as runway layouts, in order to avoid airspace and traffic-control problems which would result from inappropriately located or uncoordinated airports and facilities.

Seventh. The CAB would continue to have as its major responsibility, the economic regulation of commercial air carriers, and assume almost completely a quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative role.

Eighth. The CAB would retain its present function of aircraft accident investigation, except to the extent that it might delegate this responsibility to the Federal Aviation Agency in the case of minor accidents; as well as the responsibility of reviewing airmen certificate denials, revocations, and suspensions. Certificates would be issued by the Federal Aviation Agency in the field of civil aviation.

This bill makes no substantive changes in the law not necessitated by the creation of this new Agency and the consequent transfer of functions.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1958, I introduced H. R. 12397, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase benefits by 15 percent across the board. I sincerely believe that this modest increase in social security benefits is essential if the system is to fulfill its purpose as set forth by one of its founders, Michigan State's Edwin E. Witte, namely, "to assure all Americans in all contingencies of life a minimum income sufficient for existence in accordance with prevailing concepts of decency."

Specifically this bill would have the effect of, first, increasing the minimum monthly benefit payable to a retired or disabled individual or survivor or dependent from $30 to $34.50; second, increasing the minimum family benefits from $50 to $57.50 per month; third, increasing the maximum monthly family benefit from $200 to $230; and fourth, increasing the maximum lump-sum death payment from $255 to $292.50, with the 15 percent increase to apply throughout the benefit structure between these minimum and maximum amounts.

The present average benefit for a retired aged individual is about $65 a month, for a totally disabled person over 50 it is about $75 a month and for an aged widow it is only about $50 a month. I contend that these amounts are shockingly low in times like these and are insufficient to provide subsistence for most of these people. Even the maximum individual payment of $108.50 is barely adequate in these days of ever-rising prices for food, shelter, and medical care.

The simple fact is that the social-security benefit structure has not kept pace with the rising cost of living and increased wages. Therefore, the relative economic position of our retired workers, dependents, and survivors is steadily deteriorating. The original act in 1935 provided for a range of monthly benefits from $10 to $85 to take effect in 1940. This was not considered luxurious at that time when the cost of living was only about 59.9 percent of the 1947–49 level. In the 18 years since 1940 the cost of living has gone up more than 100 percent to 122.5 but the maximum social-security benefit has lagged shamefully, having increased only about 35 percent.

The last increase in social-security benefits was voted in 1954. But between 1954 and 1957 disposable per capita income went up 12 percent and average weekly wages in manufacturing went up 14.6 percent. As we are all painfully aware, the consumer price index has risen 6.7 percent from 1954 to date. But this figure does not tell the whole story. The elements of the cost of living for an elderly retired person are

quite different from those for a younger person. While the older family may spend relatively less than the average for homes and home furnishings they spend substantially more for medical care, and medical costs have risen more rapidly than any other element of the cost of living. These costs in November 1957 were 40 percent above the 1947–49 level while the overall consumer price index rose 21.6 percent in the same period. The impact of this serious increase in medical costs can be appreciated when we realize that, according to a nationwide survey, persons over 65 incur 57 percent greater medical costs than does the general population. And hospital expenses for the average person in this age group are 92 percent greater than for the population as a whole.

So much for the overall problem. Let us look at the situation from the standpoint of an individual retired family. Several years ago a labor union in my State of Michigan worked out a budget for an elderly couple in Detroit. It was not an extravagant budget in any sense—for example, it allowed one-eighth of a pound of butter per person per week, one work shirt and 1⅓ other shirts per year for the husband, 1 house dress per year, 1 umbrella every 20 years and eighty-five one-hundredths of a handkerchief per year for his wife. Yet this modest budget in 1955 prices amounted to about $200 per month which is just about twice what the average retired worker and his wife are now receiving from social security.

Moreover, who can ignore the distressing circumstances which led a woman to write to syndicated columnist Ray Henry this winter:

> My father is 75 and collects $53 a month from social security. That's his only income. I've been taking care of him for 14 years but now find it necessary to place him in a nursing home. Could he collect any other Government benefits to help with this added expense?

The answer to this question was that he might be eligible for the federally aided old-age assistance program. But is public assistance with its needs test the answer to the problem of pitifully inadequate social security insurance benefits? Obviously not. Congress has expressed its views repeatedly on this issue as in the report of the Senate Committee on Finance on the social security amendments of 1950, which reads:

> Unless the insurance system is expanded and improved so that it in fact offers a basic security to retired persons and to survivors, there will be continual and nearly irresistible pressure for putting more and more Federal funds into the less constructive assistance programs. We consider the assistance method to have serious disadvantages as a long-run approach to the Nation's social-security problem. We believe that improvement of the American social security system should be in the direction of preventing dependency before it occurs, and of providing more effective income protection, free from the humiliation of a test of need.

And again in 1954 the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on the social security amendments of 1954 stated:

> The protection afforded by the (Social Security) program may be considered adequate only when benefits are high enough, when added to savings and assets normally accumulated, so most beneficaries will not have to apply for public assistance for the ordinary expenses of living.

I have not even touched on the present unemployment situation which of course has been another serious blow to the economic well-being of the older worker who has always had difficulty finding a job. Thus more and more of the people who are able and willing to work after 65 are being forced to retire and rely entirely on income from social security.

I feel we can no longer brush aside this problem which is fast becoming a national disgrace. We must keep faith with our older citizens and relieve their distressing economic plight. I therefore urge every member to support this bill.

LEGAL MAZE CONFUSES EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, at least 35 dual-employment and dual-compensation statutes are now in effect. It is a practical impossibility to administer them, let alone avoid repeated cases of inadvertent hardship and injustice.

The Army, Navy, Air Force Journal for May 17 editorialized on the situation as follows:

> LEGAL MAZE CONFUSES EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED
>
> A most serious effect of the plethora of laws which bar retired officers from many categories of employment is that it prevents industry and the Government from making use of the skill and experience of this outstanding group of trained executives. This is particularly important at this time when our shortage of manpower in many professional areas is a matter of grave concern.
>
> As the article on the first page of this issue reveals, the dual-compensation, dual-employment, and conflict-of-interest laws, many of which date back into the 19th century, prevent the Government and industry from utilizing these valuable men and, at the same time, hold the retired officers back from incomes which could supplement their small retired pay.
>
> The Department of Defense would do well to initiate a complete restudy of the entire problem with a view to presenting Congress with a comprehensive report of the evils of the present laws and recommendations for repeal.

So tangled is the situation that a study I made of it last year consumed 18 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to explain. That study was the basis of H. R. 11744 and its predecessor, H. R. 1943, which I have introduced. The later bill was introduced making slight changes in the earlier bill, with which changes Chairman Harris Ellsworth, of the United States Civil Service Commission advised the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service there would be no objection from the Commission to passage of the legislation.

Since this is a subject which needs rectifying, and since there is no objection to the means I have initiated to accomplish it, I am in hopes that committee action on H. R. 11744 will be soon forthcoming. The same issue of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal carried, as mentioned in the editorial, the following article which enforces my position:

> DEFENSE DEPARTMENT MAY STEP IN TO EASE SERVICE CONFUSION OVER CONFLICT LAWS
>
> Confusion and conflicting service policies confront and bewilder retired military officers who seek employment with the Government or with private firms doing business with the Government.
>
> One critical problem is that the three service judge advocates disagree on many points of law concerning dual compensation, dual employment, and conflict of interest. In these areas, Pentagon legal authorities say, the three services hold almost irreconcilable positions.
>
> The situation now is such that a retired officer from one service could, under certain circumstances, forfeit his retired pay for selling a 10-cent comb to another military department, but suffer no penalty for signing a multi-million-dollar research and development contract.
>
> Officers from the other services might be penalized if they performed either of these actions.
>
> Further confusing the retired officers' problem are conflicting decisions of the courts and Comptroller General, both of whom can override retired policies set by the military departments.
>
> To avoid risking their retired pay and rights, and even stiff jail terms, retired military people must place their primary reliance upon the decisions of their respective judge advocates. These authorities, in turn, concede they are not quite sure of what many of the laws affecting retired people really mean.
>
> As a consequence of this muddled state of affairs, it can be expected that the Department of Defense soon will take a hand in straightening out postservice employment problems for retired military officers. It will not be able to achieve complete uniformity among all the services, officials say, because some conflict-of-interest laws apply only to one service.
>
> AN URGENT NECESSITY
>
> The urgent requirement for clear-cut decisions is pointed up in new charges by the president of the New York City Bar Association. He said the present conflict-of-interest laws provide loopholes for the unscrupulous and traps for the honest but unwary.
>
> President Louis M. Loeb of the New York bar group declared this week that most of the conflict-of-interest laws were enacted in earlier, simpler days. "Now," he said, "they are inadequate to protect the Government from subtle forms of corruption and unreasonably discourage able persons from taking Government positions."
>
> Mr. Loeb's assertions were nothing new to retired military officers. They have been confounded by similar restrictions for decades.
>
> Similar attacks on the dual compensation, dual employment, and conflict-of-interest laws echo yearly through the halls of Congress, but with little practical effect.
>
> MORE THAN 35 STATUTES
>
> Pinpointing the need for revision of the statutes relating to the employment of retired military officers, Representative CRAIG

HOSMER (Republican, of California) told the House of Representatives last year that "at least 35 dual employment and dual compensation statutes are now in effect. It is a practical impossibility to administer them, let alone avoid repeated cases of inadvertent hardship and injustice. This is a situation badly needing a remedy."

The Pentagon in 1956 went before Congress to urge outright repeal of the dual employment and dual compensation statutes.

Service officials described the laws as extremely complicated, discriminatory, overlapping, and unrealistic.

Chairman PAUL J. KILDAY (Democrat, of Texas), of the Special House Armed Services Subcommittee which considered the 1956 charges, agreed that there is room for considerable improvement.

None has been forthcoming.

At present, the scores of unrelated restrictions on the employment of retired officers add up to a series of ever-tightening barriers. Lack of knowledge about any of these might cost an officer loss of his retired pay, a stiff jail sentence, or both.

EIGHTEEN HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOUR BARRIER STILL UP

The basic restrictions upon post-service employment of retired military officers prohibits them from holding Government positions if either their retired pay or Government salary would equal or exceed $2,500 per year. Contained in the Dual Employment Act of 1894 (28 Stat. 205, as amended, 5 U. S. C. 62), these restrictions apply almost exclusively to Regular officers and warrant officers retired for length of service.

Enlisted men advanced to officer grade upon retirement, pursuant to an act of Congress, do not usually fall under the prohibitions of the act. If, however, they were appointed as officers on the retired list by the President, they become subject to the dual employment limitations.

Reserve and National Guard officers are not restricted by the 64-year-old statute. This discrimination is reserved solely for Regulars with at least 20 years' service.

Exemptions to the Dual Employment Act, if listed together, might fill a good sized telephone book. They apply to: elected officials of the Federal Government; officials appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, certain types of temporary employment; and a multitude of other positions exempted by the Congress, courts, and Comptroller General.

THE SECOND BIG HURDLE

When and if a retired officer finds he is eligible for Government employment under the Dual Employment Act of 1894, he has only jumped the first hurdle. The next step to clear is the Dual Compensation Act (47 Stat. 406, as amended, 5 U. S. C. (Supp. IV) 59a (1955)), which dates to the 1932 depression.

This act basically provides that when the combined retired pay and pay from a civilian Government job exceeds $10,000, the officer affected must forfeit any portion of his retired pay which brings him over the limit. If the civilian job pays $10,000, he forfeits all his retired pay for the period concerned. If it is less, he may receive only the difference between his civilian salary and the $10,000 limit.

The Dual Compensation Act does not apply to retired warrant officers, retired Reserve, or retired National Guard officers.

Also exempted from its provisions are: officers retired for disability incurred either in combat or by an instrumentality of war during specified periods of hostilities; and officers who pursue intermittent employment on a fee basis, when the job is not considered to be an office or position of the United States.

COMPTROLLER OVERRULES COURT

Other types of intermittent and temporary Government employment may fall under the prohibitions of this act and could result in a prorated forfeiture of the officer's retired pay during the period of his employment.

Disability retired officers who are not covered in the initial exemptions of the Dual Compensation Act, have been able to get around it by waiving their retired pay in favor of receiving Veterans' Administration compensation. By doing this they avoid all salary restrictions.

A wider area of Government employment would be open to retired officers if the Comptroller General followed United States Court of Claims and Supreme Court decisions defining an "officer of the United States." These decisions would allow all retired officers to work for corporations wholly owned by the United States, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Comptroller has been adamant. He says that retired Regular officers cannot work for these corporations. The military departments have abided by the Comptroller's decision.

ANOTHER WAY OUT?

From the foregoing it appears that the retired officers' problem of post-service employment might easily be solved by completely forgetting about Government employment and seeking a position in private industry. This is far from true.

Rising from the dark crevasses of the United States Code come the conflict-of-interest statutes, which follow him wherever he may go. These statutes should be etched upon the mind of every retired officer, for they apply even to the most unlikely situations.

As a starter, all retired Regular officers are prohibited for 2 years after retirement from selling, contracting to sell, or negotiating to sell "any supplies or war materials" to any of the services, the Defense Department, Coast Guard, or Coast and Geodetic Survey. The penalty for violating this law (67 Stat. 437, 5 U. S. C. (Supp. IV) 59c (1953)) is loss of retired pay.

Navy authorities consider supplies and war materials to include any conceivable item, including "pocket combs and soft drinks." An "important exception" is made by the Navy in the case of professional services, "such as plans, specifications, designs, or drawings," which it does not consider to be supplies or war materials within the meaning of the above statute.

This presents the interesting possibility of one retired Navy officer being deprived of his pay for selling a comb to the Air Force, while another may continue to receive full pay and benefits when contracting for research contracts, plans, specifications, designs, drawings, or any other professional services.

Air Force officials interpret the above statute more strictly. They say they could not follow the Navy interpretation. If an Air Force officer were selling drawings to the Navy within 2 years after retirement, they said, his retired pay would be stopped immediately. In some cases, they said, they would ask for a Comptroller General ruling on the subject.

Army authorities report they are still researching the point of what constitutes "supplies and materials" within the meaning of the conflict-of-interest restriction.

THE ROAD TO JAIL

Added restrictions on retired officers' activities are imposed by the criminal conflict-of-interest laws, especially the one contained in title 18, United States Code, section 281 (1949).

This statute provides a $10,000 fine or up to 2 years in jail if an officer represents anyone, including himself, in the sale of anything to the Government through the department in which he holds retired status.

The effect of this restriction is disputed among service legal authorities.

Specific quarrel with this provision is taken by the Navy in its Reference Guide to Employment Activities of Retired Naval Personnel. Here the Navy Judge Advocate notes that of all the major laws restricting the employment activities of retired officers, "these criminal statutes are the most ambiguous and it is often extremely difficult to predict with any degree of certainty whether proposed activities will violate these provisions."

The Navy says, in effect, it does not know what the statutes mean. Retired Navy officers may not learn what the statute means until they find themselves in trouble—possibly even in newly issued, striped uniforms.

Similar criminal statutes apply to officers who, within 2 years after retirement, act as agents or attorneys or who assist in prosecuting claims against the United States, especially when they concern subject matter with which the officer was directly connected while on active duty (18 U. S. C. 283 (1949)). These provisions seem to hit especially hard at JAG officers.

NO ACTION IN CONGRESS

With regard to dual employment and dual compensation revisions, little action is expected in this session of Congress. A number of bills have been introduced and referred to committees, but have been given no further consideration.

Prospects for revision of Federal conflict-of-interest policies are better as a result of a recently issued special staff report on the subject to the House Judiciary Committee.

The judiciary report emphasizes that "existing conflict-of-interest law comprises overlapping, inconsistent, and incomplete provisions, which not only differ among themselves with respect to the classes of persons covered, but are also subject to numerous general and special exemptions. These exemptions in turn often contain their own limitations on exempted conduct.

"Despite the importance of the subject which today affects millions of Americans directly," the report continues, "there has been little judicial interpretation on the conflict-of-interest statutes, and almost no such interpretation of the exemptions and their scope.

"All this," the report concludes, "makes existing laws extremely difficult to construe."

No legislation has yet been introduced to implement the report's recommendations for a sweeping revision of the conflict-of-interest area.

UNCORRECTED INJUSTICE IN THE MILITARY PAY BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President signed the military pay bill. I am delighted this bill has become law. It was greatly needed to give assurance to the people of our country that our military forces will continue to have highly qualified officers and military personnel to conduct the operations of national defense.

Although this legislation is greatly needed, I regret extremely it does not correct the discrimination involved in the failure to permit all officers of the military services to credit training time in the computation of their longevity

retired pay. Some can credit this time, while others cannot, due to the fact they did not take their training at a certain time. Now this seems to me to be an inequity that should have been corrected, and since it was not corrected, something should be done about it. The situation is unjust and unfair.

In regard to this inequity, I should like to focus the attention of the entire Congress upon a news article which quite clearly points up this injustice and is in accord with efforts I have made to try to correct this wrong.

In the most recent issue of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal, dated May 17, 1958, there appears on page 1 a most interesting and enlightening article. It deals with an area of disparity or discrimination which the recently enacted military pay bill fails to correct. I request unanimous consent that this brief article be printed in its entirety in the body of the RECORD at this point:

TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SERVICE ACADEMY GRADUATES CONTINUES; PENTAGON PONDERS PROBLEM AFTER PAY DELAY

The Pentagon, which understandably sidetracked requests for remedial longevity legislation in order to streamline action on the pay bill, now must make up its mind what to do—if anything—about the continued pay discrimination against graduates of the service Academies and ROTC programs.

Thousands of Academy and ROTC officers today are denied longevity pay benefits available to other officers.

The denial of longevity credit to these officers for time spent at the Academies and in ROTC programs creates a disparity of an estimated $10,000 for each officer over a 30-year career, based on the present pay scales.

Here is the story:

From 1884 to 1912, service Academy time was counted for longevity pay purposes. Legislation passed in 1912 stipulated, however, that only active commissioned service could be counted.

The equity of this action was breached in 1942 with the passage of pay legislation authorizing longevity credit for active duty and virtually any and all inactive service in some 16 different Reserve components—but not Academy or ROTC time.

For example, officers who prepared for their commissions in V–12 and similar World War II programs receive longevity credit. So do those who graduate from officer candidate programs, or whose college time was spent while members of the Navy Reserve officers candidate program and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class.

Longevity credit is given also for Air Force and Navy aviation cadet programs. College students who are members of Reserve, National Guard, Air National Guard, or Coast Guard Reserve units also benefit.

A curious anomaly is that an Academy cadet or midshipman who fails an Academy course and then enlists in the armed services can count the Academy time for longevity. But he can't count the Academy service if he graduates.

The Academy time is creditable for civilian retirement from the Government; it also counts for Congressional retirement.

Interesting fact is that thousands of young men who enlist for only 6 months active duty under the Reserve Forces Act and who then attend college receive longevity credit during their educational careers, since they are members of the Reserve.

Had the new pay legislation eliminated longevity entirely, the inequity would have been resolved. But longevity was not eliminated.

Though modified, it remains a major factor in determining a military man's pay.

Thus, it would seem likely that the Defense Department, having asked in 1956 for remedial action on the Academy-ROTC issue, would now be moved, with the passage of the pay bill, to reexamine existing discriminatory laws.

The original Pentagon proposal would have restricted longevity credit for Academy and ROTC time to officers with at least 4 years active service, thereby assuring rewards exclusively for career people.

No military officer would object to such a restriction. Unless the Pentagon takes the initiative anew to eliminate inequities in officer pay, it is certain there will be cause for dissatisfaction and the feeling that Academy and ROTC graduates still are receiving second-class consideration when it comes to pay.

This article is very closely related to an amendment I offered on the House floor on March 25, 1958 when the military pay bill, H. R. 11470, was before this body for consideration. The Army, Navy, Air Force Journal's article also is closely related to a letter dated April 3, 1958, which I wrote to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the other body enclosing a proposed amendment to H. R. 11470 which I requested the chairman of that committee to cause to be considered when his committee took action on the military pay bill of 1958, H. R. 11470.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter of April 3, 1958, to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the other body, together with the enclosed proposed amendment, be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: On Tuesday, March 25, 1958, there came to my attention a matter which constitutes a very clear area of disparity or inequity in the treatment of several hundred persons now on the retired lists of the uniformed services in regard to the crediting or noncrediting of certain service for purposes of computing their longevity retired pay; particularly is this true by comparison with the more-favored treatment long enjoyed by some hundreds of others likewise on the retired lists of the uniformed services.

You will recognize the matter as not a new one. The very length of time that this inequitable situation has existed compounds and aggravates the basic unfairness involved. Upon having this unnecessary disparity recalled to your mind, you would, I sincerely believe and trust, desire to take the lead in removing it, for no just person will fail to support as fundamental the American principle of equality of treatment for all.

The matter that I have in mind, I wish to reemphasize beyond possibility of misunderstanding, relates specifically and only to the retired lists. It is this:

(a) On the retired lists of the several uniformed services there is a sizeable group of retired career officers who very properly enjoy the privilege of crediting, for longevity retired pay purposes, their years of service as cadets or midshipmen at West Point, Annapolis, or the Coast Guard Academy at New London. I say "very properly" because over the years the courts of the land, including the United States Supreme Court as well, have unequivocally held such service to be in fact full-time active military service during which the cadets or midshipmen were, and still are, 100 percent subject to military (including naval) jurisdiction, military discipline, and military law. The retired officers in this group are fortunate enough to have graduated from their respective service Academies in the classes of 1916 and prior thereto.

(b) On the very same retired lists of the uniformed services there is another body of less fortunate retired officers—officers different from the first group only in the fact that they graduated from their respective service Academies in classes subsequent to that of 1916; no other distinction exists between the two groups. But by laws enacted in 1912 and 1913, sparked by a misguided economy drive over 45 years ago, the post-1916 group is incomprehensibly even now denied credit for the same identical class of full-time active military service that is, and always has been, creditable for the preceding group.

So obviously unfair and inconsistent is this situation that I very earnestly hope and urge that you may cause a simple, appropriate, corrective amendment to be written into H. R. 11470, the currently pending Military Pay Adjustment Act, when your Committee acts upon it. I enclose herewith a suggested self-justifying amendment to accomplish the desired aim.

The eminently fair and sensible action which you took on the Senate floor March 31, 1952, in accepting an amendment to the Armed Forces Pay Raise Act of 1952 (H. R. 5715, 82d Cong.), an amendment which Senator HAYDEN offered in order to revive the right of some 300 older retired officers to have their Academy service count for retired pay purposes, strongly suggests to me that if Senator HAYDEN'S amendment had been drawn in terms broad enough to encompass the Academy service performed by any and all retired officers, and thus eliminate the existing inequitable artificiality that grants it to some while denying it to others, your action would have been equally as fair, sensible, understanding, and directly effective as it was with respect to the narrower Hayden amendment that you did accept.

Further to emphasize the ridiculous aspects of the situation as it now exists, permit me to cite the following groups of persons who do now enjoy, for retirement pay purposes, the right to credit for any service they may have performed at any time as cadets or midshipmen at our service Academies:

(1) United States Senators and United States Representatives.

(2) Civil-service employees.

(3) FBI agents after 20 years of FBI service.

(4) All enlisted men of the uniformed services (any service as cadets or midshipmen that they may have performed at any time is creditable in computing both their active duty longevity pay and their retired pay as well).

(5) Officers now on the retired lists who were appointed to West Point prior to August 25, 1912, or to Annapolis prior to March 5, 1913; that is, the classes of 1916 and prior classes.

By remarkable contrast, the only persons who are now deprived, unfairly deprived, of the right to credit their cadet or midshipman service in computing their longevity retired pay are career retired officers whose only offense is to have been born too late to become members of the more favored classes prior to 1917.

The Senate Armed Services Committee in April 1948 recognized the absurdity of this situation when it favorably reported, and the Senate passed, a bill (S. 657, 80th Cong. considerably broader than the amendment that I urge; it was a bill to credit

"Service as a Cadet, Midshipman, or Aviation Cadet for Pay Purposes" applicable not only to the retired list but also to the active list as well. The committee report (S. Rept. No. 1154, 80th Cong., 2d sess.) estimated the annual cost to the Government of that bill, embracing both active and retired payrolls, to be less than $2,275,000. Since the amendment that I urge applies only to the retired lists, the cost of my proposal will obviously be considerably less than that estimated for S. 657 in 1948; therefore, I doubt if it would exceed $500,000 annually.

After passing the Senate in April 1948, S. 657 was favorably reported by the House Armed Services Committee (H. Rept. No. 1908, 80th Cong.) May 11, 1948; in that report the following significant language appears:

"The proposed legislation will eliminate an unjust discrimination now in existence with respect to persons who served as cadets, midshipmen, or aviation cadets. Under existing law, every other type of active or inactive military and naval service is credited for longevity pay purposes."

(Then, after listing all the various types of service—Regular, Reserve, National Guard, Organized Militia, Naval Militia, Philippine Scouts, Philippine Constabulary, and numbers of others—creditable for computing both active and retired pay, H. Rept. No. 1908 goes on to say:)

"Thus, under existing law, cadets, midshipmen, and aviation cadets are the only group of persons in the military and naval service who do not now receive full longevity credit for all active duty. And yet, personnel in these capacities serve on active duty in every sense of the word. They are amenable to military or naval law, and are subject to all orders of their superior officers.

"The argument that these persons receive free education at Government expense overlooks the fact that the training they receive is of a specialized nature. It prepares them for the profession of arms, in the interests of national security. This type of training is especially designed to fit them solely for military or naval careers, and not for other professions."

(And in conclusion the 1948 House report states:)

"The Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force all concur in the proposed legislation and the Bureau of the Budget offers no objection."

Despite the strongest possible endorsement of S. 657 in 1948 by the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and the House, this bill was passed over "without prejudice" when it came up on call of the House Consent Calendar June 8, 1948; Congress 12 days later adjourned on June 20, 1948, without completing action to relieve the long-standing unjust discrimination at which S. 657 aimed.

Now in 1958, 10 years later, the superb opportunity presents itself to remove that discriminatory aspect which relates to the retired lists by adopting some such simple amendment as I earnestly urge be written into the pending Military Pay Adjustment Bill. I only regret that this entire matter came to my attention too late to permit thorough, adequate research, preparation, and effective action when H. R. 11470 came before the House on Tuesday, March 25, 1958.

In passing, it may be well to recall that throughout their entire active service careers, credit for their cadet or midshipman service was very properly accorded in computing the military pay of Generals MacArthur, Eisenhower, Bradley, Arnold, Spaatz, Kenney; Admirals Leahy, King, Nimitz, Halsey, Spruance, Denfeld, Fechteler, Radford, Carney, Lynde McCormick, and others too numerous to mention—all solely because they were lucky enough to have entered West Point or Annapolis prior to the 1912–13 arbitrary and discriminatory cutoff dates over 45 years ago.

In closing please permit me once more, in the interests of simple fairness and justice to the deserving retired career officers who have sustained this inequity, to urge very earnestly that you may undertake to offer, and to secure approval of, the indisputably fair amendment that I enclose herewith. Whether you employ the language of the proposed amendment as I have drawn it, or revise it completely to attain the same worthy end is entirely immaterial to me; I simply and strongly hope that the ends of fairness and equity sought may now be achieved while this magnificent opportunity presents itself.

I am sending a carbon copy of this letter to Senator BRIDGES with my earnest request that he give his fullest, active, aggressive support to the end that this worthy objective now belatedly may be gained.

With very friendly regards and all best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

AN AMENDMENT TO H. R. 11470, THE MILITARY PAY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1958

At the appropriate place insert the following: "Notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act, any type or class of full-time active military or naval service that is creditable in computing the longevity retired pay of any retired members of the uniformed services who are entitled to receive such pay under this or any other act shall be creditable in computing the longevity retired pay of all retired members of the uniformed services who are entitled to receive such pay, and who have performed the same type or class of full-time active military or naval service; and this credit shall be applicable to the provisions of sections 202, 411, 412, 511, 512, and 520 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (Public Law 351, 81st Congress): *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed as authorizing the longevity retired pay of any such retired members to exceed 75 percent of their corresponding active duty longevity basic pay."

And finally, to add emphasis to the disparity and discrimination that still exists even under the new military pay bill, under unanimous consent, I ask that a brief two-paragraph article appearing on the back page of the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal issue of May 17, 1958, entitled "Comptroller Credits Reserve Service," to be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point:

COMPTROLLER CREDITS RESERVE SERVICE

The Comptroller General has ruled that service in the Auxiliary Reserve may be counted in computing longevity for retired pay purposes.

Basing his decision (B–135426) on section 202 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, the Comptroller awarded Col. Bert B. Kuss, USAF, retired, the difference between retired pay based on 26 and 30 years' service.

I hope that the Congress, and that the Department of Defense, may in the near future act to remove the area of disparity and discrimination which the foregoing articles from the Army Navy, Air Force Journal and my letter and amendment seek to illuminate and eliminate.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PATRIOT'S DAY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since the colonial days in New England until the present, countless Americans from the six New England States left their original homes, pushed their way across the Adirondacks into the vast lands of America. Many of these people were among the original settlers of new territories which later became new States in the Union. They helped to establish new communities all the way from Massachusetts Bay to the Golden Gate.

Today, American citizens with a New England heritage may be found in almost every State and community in the country. In view of this fact, plans have been underway for well over a year to encourage these people and their families to come back to their New England homeland for a visit. This general invitation is known as Yanke homecoming. It is hoped many Americans will visit the New England States during the next several months.

Yankee homecoming had its official beginning on Patriot's Day, April 19, 1958, at the celebration in front of the Minute Man statue on Lexington Common. Mr. Speaker, following are my remarks which I made on this occasion:

SPEECH OF HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, PATRIOT'S DAY, APRIL 19, 1958, LEXINGTON, MASS.

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, to come here again on this great day to celebrate the birth of our country's freedom is tremendously inspiring. For many, perhaps some of you, who pass over this precious ground every day, its deep significance may be lost in the rush of busy responsibilities. Many times during the year I pass by Lexington Common and I want you to know that every time I do so I feel a great and deep sense of honor and pride in the fact I am an American.

There are three inspiring monuments which seem to constitute great oases of inspiration for the people of our Nation.

In the constantly changing light of the dawn, of midday, and of evening, the Washington Monument, reaching into the sky, makes us proud we are Americans.

Then there is that magnificent temple on the Potomac wherein sits the great Lincoln looking out over the Nation. When we look up into the face of President Lincoln, we know America has a soul and that peace is our Nation's cornerstone.

The third monument stands here at the apex of Lexington Common. Materially, it is not a great structure. Comparatively, it is small in physical size. It is inexpensive in cost. When we look at this monument, we see this small pile of stone upon which stands the embattled farmer in his clothes of the soil looking straight at the world in front of him. When we look at him we know America has courage.

Thousands and thousands and thousands of Americans from all sections of this great country come to Washington each year to see that towering monument of simplicity to Washington that gives out truth, determination, and glory. And they go to visit President Lincoln, from whose great inspiring

face they receive strength and friendliness and a sense of safety and goodness.

Just as these thousands of Americans visit these two great oases of inspiration in our American life, I wish they would also plan to visit this Minute Man soldier standing on the apex of this precious ground of Lexington Common. From this noble figure everyone would receive courage—courage to face up to the problems of today and tomorrow, courage to face man's world, and courage to do the right. I urge my fellow Americans wherever they may be to come to Lexington and experience this inspiration.

This is the 19th of April and on this day in 1775 the small group of farmer patriots of this farm community, represented by this noble Minute Man statue, joined together to stand their ground. They had made their decision, they nobly dared to be free. When they fired, the whole world heard the crack of their muskets. This was the day freedom was born.

Every square inch of soil on this Common here at Lexington is very precious. It is something to see, to feel and to think about. Today as we celebrate this first battle for freedom, we are beginning here an invitation and an urging of Americans everywhere to come to visit, in the form of a kind of Yankee homecoming, a coming home to where this precious, oh this very precious, thing we call freedom, was born. Today I welcome everyone who is visiting Lexington Common. I hope Americans throughout the Nation will come home to freedom's birthplace soon and enjoy the thrill, the inspiration, and the glory of this birthplace of freedom.

As you stand on Lexington Common, in the mind's eye you will envision this group of young American farmers assembled with their muskets ready to meet the British as they marched in from Boston. You can see the determination in their faces, you know they could not take one step backward. And as you envision them standing here, you all of a sudden comprehend and know why America is great. You know that as long as America is strong, the freedom that was born here will not perish from this earth.

As the shadows of eventing strike their long lines across this Common, we know it will soon be forgotten what some of us say here but Americans can never forget what they did here.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech I delivered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ASYLUM FOR POLITICAL REFUGEES: THE CARE OF HSUAN WEI

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there are many who are critical of Vice President NIXON'S recent trip to South America. While they do not criticize his courage or composure, for he showed these to a very high degree, they question the wisdom of his having gone at all to countries where it was certain he would run into trouble and where his visit would aggravate, rather than allay existing hostilities.

As a good-will mission, the visit can only be described as a failure. It was foredoomed to failure because over the past few years the foundation for good will between the United States and the Latin American countries had all but crumbled. Our relations had deteriorated to such extent that the good-neighbor policy had become a bad-neighbor policy, and in the words of our colleague, Congressman REUSS of Wisconsin, "Stones have been hurled at American officials and American installations in Venezuela, Lebanon, and Algeria, but I suggest that those stones were not hurled at individuals or at libraries. They were hurled at an image of an America that to those people seems unconcerned with human rights; an America that seems preoccupied with military might; an America which lets interest in wheat and wool, in lead and zinc, in copper and oil obscure our good neighborliness; an America that too often is identified with foreign colonialism or with corrupt native dictators."

To send even as august a personage as the Vice President of the United States, bringing only himself and his charming wife instead of a concrete policy or a program to establish the basis for better relations, was to court disaster, and disaster occurred.

But regardless of whether there may be disagreement as to whether the trip should or should not have been made, certainly we concur completely with the Vice President in his assertion upon his return that the trip served a very useful purpose in bringing out the weakness of our foreign policy in the way in which our Government has been doing business with dictators.

In a statement appearing in Sunday's press, the Vice President declared:

> The problem of dictatorships in Latin America is a ball and chain around the necks of the United States.

And that—

> The United States must be extremely careful not to appear to be trying to keep the dictators in power.

The article continues:

> Mr. NIXON takes the position that the emotional feelings against dictators is so powerful in Latin America that the United States cannot afford to give the impression that it is placing its arms around authoritarian rulers.

In this respect, the Vice President is quite right. A foreign policy which embraces dictatorships is built on shifting sand, and any attempt to rationalize our relationship with dictators because they profess to be anti-Communist should not cause us to lose sight of this reality. Anticommunism, while desirable, cannot of itself vitiate acts of oppression, repression, or tyranny which mark the police state nor prevent the opprobium which such actions bring in the minds and hearts of the peoples of the world. A foreign policy which is aimed at benefiting the United States and which seeks to engender good will for us with other nations of the world must sustain the truths upon which our Nation was founded. A world caught in turbulent ferment remembers well and with approval the dynamics surrounding the birth of our Nation. Rabbi Morris Adler, of Detroit, Mich., had occasion to recount them recently at a celebration of George Washington's birthday, and he did so most eloquently. This is what the Rabbi said:

> The most important single event in our early history, the event which preceded our organizing into a Nation was a revolution. We began with a revolution. We began by rebelling against tyranny. We began by opposing the inherited and entrenched privileges of royalty and the aristocratic class which it supported. We began with a fight—a fight against oppression, and the whole world must know that the Revolution of 1776 has not yet ended in 1958; that there is still in the American spirit and outlook, a rebelliousness against all tyranny; a revolt against any sheik or monarch or president or dictator who abridges the inalienable rights of people; who curtails their freedom; who deprives them of those freedoms and liberties which were meant for every human being who draws breath. What it would mean to the undecided and uncommitted portions of the world if in their negotiations with us they recognized that we are not only a country of power, but that we are a country of revolution.
>
> What America represents is not simply an army, but a system of ideas, a system of values, a system of convictions which will ultimately spell the doom of every oppressor, of every tyrant, of every czar, of every dictator anywhere. How millions of little people hungering for nothing more than the sunlight, freedom, and humble opportunities, would be heartened if they saw America not only as a country with millions and billions of dollars in trade, but as a country that is the eternal opponent, the everlasting adversary of all dictatorship, of all tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, this is the basis for a good American foreign policy. Mr. NIXON'S statement is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, because it bring into focus the very important matter of our relationship with authoritarian governments. The Vice President declared in South America that all dictators were "repugnant to Americans." One wonders what the Vice President meant by that statement. Did he mean that all authoritarian governments were repugnant to Americans? Did he refer only to South American dictators? Or was he speaking about the repressive methods of government with which dictatorships are identified?

Mr. Speaker, what should be our relationship with other authoritarian anti-Communist governments whom we recognize, as for example the government of Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa? I have selected this government for consideration because there is in my office the case of Hsuan Wei, the Chinese Nationalist marine captain who has filed an application for political asylum, which is now pending with the Attorney General, and on whose behalf I have filed a private bill. The application for asylum is based upon Hsuan Wei's fears that he will be subjected to physical persecution if he is returned to Formosa, for having made statements critical of the government of Chiang Kai-shek. I shall discuss this at greater length in a few moments. But this case does raise the problem of what our Government should do when an authoritarian government seeks the return of one of its citizens who has had occasion to criticize the government, and for that reason is subject to punishment.

In other dealings with authoritarian governments, the need exists for co-

operation in many matters. But to my mind the need for such cooperation does not require us to accept or to condone totalitarian practices or repressions of individual freedom which may parallel those of the Communist state which is Chiang's avowed enemy. Heretofore, our Government has tended to look the other way on such occasions, in the hope that Chiang's administration could in time be persuaded to adopt more democratic methods, and some progress has been made and is being made in this respect. Unfortunately there still exists too great a disregard for the rights of the individual and if we continue to overlook these, particularly when we are called upon to take a position either for or against that government's undemocratic procedures, we must continue to be subject to censure for having approved—tacitly, if not otherwise—the type of dictatorial methods which Vice President NIXON described as being repugnant to all Americans. We do no service either to ourselves or to Chiang's government if we surrender our beliefs to his.

This is what we are called upon to do in the case of Hsuan Wei. Mr. Speaker, as the facts have been presented to me, Hsuan Wei is now 29 years old. He lives today in Evanston, Ill., has a bachelor of science degree from Northwestern University in mathematics, and is presently enrolled in its graduate school of mathematics. He has been employed by Marshall Field & Co. for the past 3 years as a cash register checker. He has supported himself and put himself through Northwestern University by his own efforts.

Hsuan was born somewhere in Russia of a Russian mother and a Chinese father. He was graduated from Tientsin High School in 1944 and then entered the Chinese West Point from which he was later graduated as a second lieutenant. During his enrollment in the Chinese Military Academy, and thereafter until he was evacuated to Formosa in 1950, he was engaged in combat, first against the Japanese and later, against the Chinese Communists. At the time of his evacuation to Formosa he was a first lieutenant in the Chinese Marine Corps. He served on Formosa from 1950 through September 1952 as the liaison officer between the Chinese Marine Corps and the American Military Mission to Formosa.

In September of 1952 he was sent to the United States for training under the Military Defense Assistance Program, having a passport and visa valid through August 1954. During this time he served at Norfolk and at Quantico, where he engaged in friendly discussions with his American classmates, who asked him questions about Formosa. He expressed himself frankly, venturing the opinion that the Chinese Government on Formosa was a police state and Chiang Kai-shek a dictator; that as long as these conditions existed, he did not feel that the Nationalists could return to the Mainland because they could not and would not be able to capture the sympathy and imagination of either the overseas Chinese or the American public.

In response to other questions about the accusations of Dr. K. C. Wu about the Chinese Nationalist Government—which were similar to Hsuan's own observations—he stated that in his opinion Dr. Wu's thesis was correct. Such frank, such perhaps indiscreet expressions of opinion brought threats on several different occasions by Captain Liu, the Chinese Naval Attaché in Washington at the Chinese Embassy, that Hsuan's life would be a forfeit when he returned to Taiwan. Captain Liu told him that K. C. Wu was a traitor and inasmuch as Hsuan had criticized Chaing Kai-shek and the Nationalist Government, he, Hsuan, would be executed when he returned to Taiwan.

Rather than return to certain death, Hsuan applied in April of 1954 for relief under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. In May of 1954 he refused to return to Formosa and wrote a letter to the Minister of National Defense of the Chinese Nationalist Government stating that he could not return to Formosa until a democratic government existed on the island. He then went to Evanston, Ill., and contacted Dr. Wu who found him a place to live.

Subsequently thereto, in November of 1954, a hearing was held on his application for permanent residence under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. At this hearing, Dr. K. C. Wu, Lt. Col. R. B. Carney, Jr., head of the American Marine Corps Mission to Formosa at the time Hsuan was there, and Capt. R. F. Henderson, another Marine who served in that Mission on Formosa, testified in substance that in their opinion, as a result of Hsuan's political expressions, it was probable that he would be executed upon his return to Formosa. Nevertheless, the application was denied by the Department of Immigration and Naturalization.

I was requested to file a private bill on his behalf, which I did. That bill is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. It will receive a hearing in the event Hsuan Wei's application for political asylum under section 243 (h) of the immigration law is rejected by the Attorney General. The Attorney General has the right to grant political asylum under the law, and that is why I am making this speech today, Mr. Speaker—to suggest to the Attorney General that the application should be granted. I suggest to the Attorney General that this case offers the opportunity to carry Mr. NIXON's statements into reality by showing the world that America is still the land which grants refuge to a political dissenter.

The United States has always given sanctuary to political refugees. Most recently it has granted political refuge to Perez Jiminez, the hated dictator of Venezuela, and Pedro Estrada, his brutal chief of police. These men were the prime causes of the hostility flung at Mr. NIXON on his recent visit to Venezuela. According to last Sunday's New York Times:

> Washington's explanation was that in granting asylum to Perez Jimenez and Pedro Estrada, it did no more than it had done for other Venezuelan refugees in the past.

For such men, who have been powerful dictators and tyrants, the Attorney General has granted political asylum. For Hsuan Wei, a political dissenter, no. Why? Why this double standard, Mr. Speaker? Why do we grant protection to the mighty who have been identified with everything which is repugnant to Americans; and why, Mr. Speaker, do we refuse to grant it to a humble individual who, in the American tradition, is in difficulty for exercising his right to speak?

I would remind the Attorney General that the cornerstone of the American system of jurisprudence is "equal justice under law."

I would remind the Attorney General, too, of the story told of Abraham Lincoln, with whom petitions for pardon were frequently filed. These applications for pardon were generally supported by letters of families and influential people, but one day, such an application for pardon came in to which there were no supporting letters attached. Lincoln turned to an aide and said: "What—does this soldier have no friends?" His aide answered: "No, Mr. President; not one." Lincoln's reply was instantaneous. "Then, by Heaven, I will be his friend."

Lincoln knew that the glory of the democratic form of government is its devotion and respect for the individual.

It is contended, however, that Hsuan Wei is not a political refugee, that he is only a deserter from the Chinese armed forces. This argument is advanced by Chinese Ambassador Hollington K. Tong, in a letter to the Washington Post of January 22, 1958. Mr. Tong wrote:

> His (Hsuan's) decision not to return to Taiwan is motivated entirely by personal reasons, and there is no truth whatsoever in the allegation that he, when repatriated, will be exposed to personal harm. As the matter stands, it is a case of desertion according to Chinese law * * * for this reason he will be subject to * * * imprisonment for an appropriate duration of time of not more than 3 years.

The Ambassador's position apparently has been adopted by Gen. J. M. Swing, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, before whom Hsuan Wei's case for asylum has been pending.

In a letter to Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, on February 4, reporting on my bill, Commissioner J. M. Swing said:

> The beneficiary is considered to be a deserter from the armed forces of the Chinese Nationalist Government which has requested his return to Formosa. His application for withholding deportation to Formosa under section 243 (h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act will be given careful consideration. However, if this application is denied, I propose to enforce the outstanding order of deportation.

And then, General Swing concluded with this statement: "I am sure that you will agree that the circumstances call for such action."

I protested to General Swing against a precipitate action which almost amounted to a prejudging of the case,

and I received another letter from General Swing, dated February 10, 1958, in which he said:

FEBRUARY 10, 1958.

DEAR MR. YATES: I assume that you are aware that Hsuan Wei, beneficiary of your bill H. R. 10042, is a captain in the Nationalist Chinese Marine Corps and came here in 1952 solely for training under the joint-defense program of this country and the Republic of China, which was financed mainly with United States funds. Of the more than 2,400 Formosan military personnel who received such training, only 6 have not returned pursuant to military orders. Captain Hsuan is 1 of these 6.

Hsuan has asked that his deportation to Formosa be withheld because he fears physical persecution if returned there. Although the indications are that he will be prosecuted rather than persecuted, he will be afforded every opportunity to submit evidence bearing on this question. * * *

This alien has been permitted to remain here since the completion of his training in 1954 while seeking judicial and legislative relief from deportation—to no avail thus far. Inasmuch as the Chinese Nationalist Government has now requested his return, further unnecessary delay would seem to involve questions of international relations.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to General Swing's last sentence. The Chinese Nationalist Government wants Hsuan Wei returned. The Commissioner apparently finds, therefore, that he has no alternative except to send him back. In taking this position the Commissioner disregards completely the purpose of section 243 (h) of the immigration law which requires him to determine whether the applicant—Hsuan Wei in this case—will be persecuted upon his return to his homeland. Any refugee in this country who applies for sanctuary because he would be subject to physical persecution from any country activates that provision of the law and requires the Commissioner, as the Attorney General's fact-finding agent, to decide whether the possibility of physical persecution actually exists. If the threat of such persecution does exist, he must decide whether the applicant may stay in our country.

Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of Immigration is a general himself. Therefore, he may be impressed by the fact that Hsuan is a military person, to whom he would concede no right to asylum because no reason exists in the military not to obey the order of superior authority. Failure or refusal to obey such an order—in this case to return to his homeland—may be classified as desertion. There is no doubt that this is the usual rule, but it can no longer be regarded as absolute when we recall the statements made by two of our top-notch military leaders in 1953 on the occasion of our refusing to repatriate soldiers of the Communist North Korean Army. It was then that Mr. Eisenhower himself established the right of political asylum for military personnel when he declared on May 7, 1953:

People who have become our prisoners cannot by any manner or means be denied the rights on which this country was founded—the right of political asylum against a persecution they fear. To force these people to go back to a life of terror and persecution is something that would violate every moral standard by which America lives. It would be unacceptable, and it cannot be done.

It was then, too, that Gen. Mark Clark, one of our negotiators, also made our position clear when he said:

Thus, the United Nations Command has given the only answer it can give. It stands on the principle that no human being shall be sent into the control of a regime he fears and detests.

Moreover, the Commissioner has overlooked the fact that Hsuan Wei was not a deserter when he committed the offense which provoked the threats that he would be executed. He was still a marine officer when his statements resulted in the threat by Captain Liu, of the Embassy, that he would be shot upon his return to Formosa. He was not a deserter at that time. The death penalty was suggested, not for desertion but because he had uttered what the Chinese naval attaché considered seditious and treasonable utterances. Having thus been promised death upon his return for having spoken his mind, Hsuan Wei decided not to return. It was only then that he became a deserter, only when desertion became the alternative to death. Perhaps Ambassador Tong is correct in stating that Chinese Nationalist law does provide for imprisonment up to 3 years for desertion, but the statement is not relevant. What is the punishment for utterances considered to be seditious or treasonable? It should be noted that the Ambassador makes no reference to Hsuan Wei's statements as constituting sedition or treason, nor to the punishment which might be applicable thereto.

Mr. Speaker, although it is appropriate to discuss the provisions of Nationalist China law which might be applicable to Hsuan's offense, I suggest that there have been instances of extra legal punishment having been accorded by the Nationalist Chinese Government to citizens who have had occasion to disagree with it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is asserted that if Hsuan Wei is not returned to his Government for punishment it will place all exchange programs with all countries in jeopardy. It is said that the President is opposed to permitting those who have come to this country to receive educational or military training, to remain here, because it would violate the agreements under which they came. The purpose of the programs is to permit those selected to come to this country not only to improve their education or to learn how to use modern weapons, but to bring back to their homelands the spirit of democracy with which they come into contact during their visit to the United States. In this way, the benefits of democracy would be spread through every nation of the world.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good argument for most cases, but it is not applicable in the case of Hsuan Wei. He comes from a nation which uses authoritarian methods. Such nations should realize that when they send their bright young people to the United States where they are given the opportunity to witness in action, the principles of individual freedom and human dignity which are the tenets of our democracy, they will be unhappy with the prospect of becoming subject once again to regimentation. Freedom to think and to speak freely are dangerous morsels with which to tempt those who have known previously only a totalitarian form of government.

The concepts of freedom and democracy that are learned and absorbed in this country cannot be forgotten easily.

I appreciate the problem which Hsuan Wei's defection may cause in our relations with Nationalist China. But we have our own ideals to sustain. I suggest that Hsuan Wei did not desert his country. He has stated that he will return to his homeland when more democratic practices are adopted. It is an unfortunate fact that systems of government like Chiang's can only lose their idealistic young people until major reforms are placed in effect. The Chinese Nationalist Government knows this well, for in the April 1957 edition of the Free China Review, which is published in Taipei, Taiwan, China, there is an editorial entitled "Returned Students Do Not Return." This is what the editorial says:

We are used to calling people who have received college education in America or Europe returned students. This expression is fast becoming archaic if the present trend to stay away from home among the Chinese students abroad is to continue. Since the war, the United States has become the mecca of our outgoing students. Every year hundreds of our young men and women would go to America for higher education, but less than scores of those who have finished their studies, if that many, would return. The majority of them would find employment in the States. Those who cannot find any job will knock around one campus after another till they get a handful of academic degrees.

The editorial concludes with this statement:

Education in the United States must no longer be a one-way traffic for our young men and young women.

It is interesting, too, Mr. Speaker, that on page 6 of the same publication there is published a Chinese proverb which reads:

No tragedy is greater than death of the heart; death of the body is second to it.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Attorney General consider what possible value would be served if Hsuan Wei were to be returned now to Formosa to be punished. What would happen to him?

First, he might be executed, as he contends, which is certainly not desired by this country and would be against our wishes.

Second, he might be imprisoned for many years, which is certainly not desired by our country, or

Third, he might be imprisoned for a term up to 3 years, as was suggested by the Chinese Nationalist Ambassador, as punishment for desertion.

Presuming that Hsuan's punishment is as indicated by the Chinese Ambassador, and that nothing unusual happened to him during his period of imprisonment, what would be his position when he was released? What message of democracy could he carry to the people of

his country? Even if he wanted to, can it be assumed by the remotest stretch of our imagination that he would be permitted to do so? The individual rights which he experienced in America—freedom of thought and freedom of speech and the right to dissent—could he exercise these in Formosa or urge that they be adopted? Would not these be considered dangerous doctrine, seditious, and treasonable material, in fact, under current regimentation? And would he not be put away again as a troublemaker?

Mr. Speaker, let us ask ourselves this simple question. In which society, in that of the Nationalist Chinese under present conditions or in our own, will Hsuan Wei be able to make a better contribution to his fellow citizens and to himself?

Mr. Speaker, the Chinese Nationalist Government demands the return of Hsuan Wei. If we send him back, will it not be an offering on the altar of expediency? Do we not perform a more noble service to the cause of democracy, to the cause of all free people when we indicate that we respect those who have the courage to rebel against totalitarian principles and espouse the cause of freedom?

I would remind the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, of another trial, a trial held in our country even before the Revolution, in which John Peter Zenger was threatened with the loss of his liberties for having dared to utter what the the Colonial Governor deemed to be seditious libel, and I would quote to the Attorney General from the statement of Andrew Hamilton to the jury on August 4, 1735, as follows:

It is said, and insisted upon by Mr. Attorney, that government is a sacred thing; that it is to be supported and reverenced; it is government that protects our persons and estates; that prevents treasons, murders, robberies, riots, and all the train of evils that overturn kingdoms and states and ruin particular persons; and if those in the administration, especially the supreme magistrates, must have all their conduct censured by private men, government cannot subsist. This is called a licentiousness not to be tolerated. It is said that it brings the rulers of the people into contempt so that their authority is not regarded, and so that in the end the laws cannot be put in execution. These, I say, and such as these, are the general topics insisted upon by men in power and their advocates. But I wish it might be considered at the same time how often it has happened that the abuse of power has been the primary cause of these evils, and that it was the injustice and oppression of these men which has commonly brought them into contempt with the people. The craft and art of such men are great and who that is the least acquainted with history or with law can be ignorant of the specious pretenses which have often been made use of by men in power to introduce arbitrary rule and destroy the liberties of a free people

Mr. Hamilton continued:

Men who injure and oppress the people under their administration provoke them to cry out and complain, and then make that very complaint the foundation for new oppressions and prosecutions. I wish that I could say there were no instances of this kind. But, to conclude, the question before the court, and you, gentlemen of the jury, is not of small nor private concern; it is not the cause of a poor printer, nor of New York alone, which you are now trying. No! It may, in its consequences, affect every free man that lives under a British Government on the main continent of America. It is the best cause; it is the cause of liberty; and I make no doubt but your upright conduct, this day, will not only entitle you to the love and esteem of your fellow citizen, but every man who prefers freedom to a life of slavery will bless and honor you as men who have baffled the attempt of tyranny, and, by an impartial and uncorrupt verdict, have laid a noble foundation for securing to ourselves, our posterity, and our neighbors that to which nature and the laws of our country have given us a right—the liberty of both exposing and opposing arbitrary power (in these parts of the world at least) by speaking and writing truth.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Attorney General that the cause of Hsuan Wei in 1958 is not unlike the cause of John Peter Zenger in 1735, I suggest to the Attorney General that he has the power and the opportunity to maintain and uphold before the world on behalf of the United States the cause of individual liberty in the same manner as did the jury in the trial of John Peter Zenger.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Does the gentleman not agree that it would be in the best interest of the United States if, as soon as possible, we took action and expelled Jiminez and his entire entourage out of the United States?

Mr. YATES. Certainly it would better relations with our neighbors to the south.

AT THE BOTTOM OF THE WELL

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, this is a speech, as revised, which was delivered at the 67th annual congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution on April 17, 1958:

Distinguished guests, my subject was Have You a Pet Federal Aid Program? After attending two of the sessions of the Daughters of the American Revolution Congress, and on further reflection, I know that most people have had their pet Government dole. They have received some of the corrupt proceeds that always come from any Government socialized project. I have learned, also, that you are all heartily ashamed of that, and that you intend to reform.

Your resolutions, so carefully prepared, are headed for the bottom of the well when they arrive in Congress on Capitol Hill.

Nearly all the people's petitions and resolutions to reduce debts and taxes and stop Socialist measures are ignored. It is about as useless for them to petition Congress in these matters today as it was for your ancestors to petition Parliament and King George in 1775.

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

Now what shall we do?

What we need to do now, my friends, is to imitate—to see to it that the great genius of organized American men and women—especially the businessmen—gets into the political battle. Their present organizations are the only forces in America that can possibly save us from an expansion of our present labor-Socialist government.

Here is how labor does it:

Mr. Meany says, "Politics is labor's big job." Top officers spring into political action. AFL–CIO is put in fighting trim.

Here is a little book: "How to Win" elections, the best book published.

Sixty-two percent of the labor press is devoted not to just talk, but to political and legislative action.

HOW TO WIN

As you carry your resolutions back home to get some action of your own, drop by the CIO–AFL offices and get a copy of "How to Win." They sell it to their workers for 50 cents. They will charge you $3, but it is worth it.

Then go to the political leaders in your county and say to them that you heard down in Washington that we are now designating candidates for Congress.

You'll find some young lawyer who would like to make the fight, but he has no money and no organization. If he runs he has to go out and get himself elected.

So, he doesn't run. Why should he?

He knows that he will be opposed by an organized political machine directed by extremely practical professional politicians who work for the leaders of organized labor. He knows that they have at their disposal more than 300,000 paid workers, in addition to millions of men and women who are so misled by our custom of misnaming socialism until they believe in it. He doesn't know how many are already working in the district, but he does know they are dedicated to work against him.

The potential statesmen of tomorrow—they may be your sons—are staying out of politics today because they know that they alone cannot possibly win out against labor's political power. That must be your deep concern.

CALL A MEETING

Call a meeting of all the people you know who believe in America and in what your ancestors fought and died for in those long-ago days.

Get the professionals who work for local conservative organizations. Get the paid secretaries of the local chamber of commerce, the local employers associations, the medical society, the dental society, the bar associations, along with the elected officers of these organizations.

This local group can start now to develop the mechanics of political action.

This takes time. It takes planning. You will need professional help. You should be thinking about providing TV time, radio shows, getting together the money for newspaper ads, campaign literature, and direct mail to voters. Start holding rallies, picnics, coffee hours, and the other social activities which cement together people with a common objective. Provide the candidates with an opportunity to find out what you want your Congressman to be and see if the candidates measure up. Think about outdoor advertising, posters, buttons, bumper stickers on automobiles, match books, pencils. They all cost money, but they are the mechanics of politics.

WHAT IS THE LAW

You may be told that these activities are against the law.

The most recent court actions are that you, the DAR, or any other association or group, or corporation, can spend money in such activities for the purpose of informing members, customers, stockholders, suppliers, and so forth, of their views on public issues, and the effect on their affairs and of the election to office of candidates who share or oppose those views.

Such organizations may use any mediums of communication known to mankind for this purpose.

Do not, as a matter of law and as a matter of practical commonsense, go around endorsing candidates. Such endorsements, without more, are of utterly no value in a political campaign.

LOCAL ACTION

Your local group must do actual work in the election districts. You will need voting records of incumbent legislators, National, State and city councils. You will need information as to political spending by organized groups in your last elections. You will need authoritative discussions of the issues. You cannot rely solely on the news that comes out of Washington to give you the kind of information you need. Your local paper is more likely to give you the kind of information you need than the big city dailies. Furthermore, your local newspaper will look upon you as a potential advertiser.

All of this material is now available from public sources, from official reports, here in Washington. Steps are being taken now by several organizations to provide you with the kind of material which will give you the substance for political action.

Only the local people—you and you and you—can come up with the manpower and the money and the enthusiasm that will even begin to offset labor's political strength.

NATIONAL ACTION

National organizations can, and God knows I hope they will, provide you with the material for you to use (as you best can decide) in selecting and electing to office the kind of men you want in office.

You, the DAR, cannot do it alone. You must persuade, demand, cajole all of the conservative organizations to lay aside their normal competitive instincts to engage in an organized, planned campaign that will encourage intelligent and conservative young people to go into public life. Many are now convinced that men of principles who believe in America and her former system of government are not wanted in public office. You must convince them otherwise.

Time is short. Labor leaders now have at their beck and call probably less than 2 million political workers out their total of 18 million dues payers. This relatively small number has been organized calculatingly in exactly the places where it will bring about the most far-reaching political results.

Your job is to offset that organized minority. You can improve upon my suggestions as to how to run a political campaign. For a mere man to even assume superiority in any area over women, with their inborn instinct—their motherhood instinct to preserve the race—is ridiculous.

YOU ARE IN THE FIGHT

How can you do nothing in this fight? If you go home and stay inside, you will be doing something. You will be doing precisely what Walter Reuther and those others whose activities bring joy to the hearts of world communism want and expect you to do.

Bob Welch, whose reputation you all know, tells me that there is only one danger which the Communists face today and only one thing they fear. That is, for the American people to be awakened sufficiently, too soon, to the very nature and methods and existence and progress of the Communist conspiracy itself.

By doing nothing you and you and you will have become another ally of world communism.

Now, before we sound another "call to arms" to organizations like yours, to business, and to the vast millions of loyal Americans who are unconsciously following the persuasive propaganda of the labor leaders, what is happening in Washington:

Instead of reducing spending and taxes, and ending Government powerplants and irrigation projects, food subsidies, Government housing, vast and unprofitable Government lending and vast foreign aid, we get more and still more, and besides some 700 other Government projects.

WHY IS THIS?

Last month, one of the most distinguished leading manufacturers in this country came to see me as ranking Republican member on the Labor and Education Committee. He wanted five perfectly sound, greatly needed amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act that we have been trying to get since 1947.

I told him, "Why, don't you know that you haven't a ghost of a chance to pass any such laws? We haven't the votes. * * *"

He looked surprised.

Another man came in and said, "We have been working on a tax-reform bill for years. We must take this incredible load of Government off the backs of the American people."

Neither of these men seemed to know, and indeed very few of us know that in the last election we, and especially the businessmen, spent millions—we don't know how many millions—to elect a President of the United States.

THE AFL–CIO CONGRESS

But the AFL–CIO political action knew that they could not elect Mr. Stevenson, so they went to work to elect a Congress, and did it. * * *

Now we have, after 10 years of their organized political action, this situation: At least 175 Members in the House of Representatives today owe their seats, wholly or partially, to the money and the work of the CIO–AFL and their allies. We now have 216 Congressmen and 45 Senators (that is, a working majority) who vote most of the time for the legislative programs of the Americans for Democratic Action. This is the front organization for labor bosses. This is the descendant of the Socialist Party in America, and the financial beneficiary of large sums from the CIO–AFL.

Free Enterprise, care of We, the People, put out a little pamphlet which you can get that gives the votes of all the Congressmen. The red votes are for the ADA propositions; the black marks are against them. It is remarkable how completely red some of our States have gone by the votes of their Congressmen. That is, they vote consistently for labor-Socialist measures * * *.

Walter Reuther is not going to be President of the United States some time in the future as some fear. He does not need to be President. Labor bosses have already taken over, in critical areas, and are now dominating Congress. When the elections are over this fall, they will have, in all probability, 25 to 30 more Members beholden to them, on the floor of the Houses of Congress. They will have been financed and selected and then elected by CIO–AFL. They expect to have no opposition by you or any other women's organizations or any businessmen's groups organized for political action.

WHAT IT MEANS

How does the AFL–CIO political action and control by a labor-Socialist government in America affect you, the Daughters of the American Revolution?

It is perfectly obvious. You have passed certain important resolutions. * * * They will not receive the consideration that they deserve * * *. They represent the wisdom that resides in you, as delegates and officers. They are important and have been for years. I know of no organization whose judgment I respect more than the Daughters of the American Revolution. * * *

WHAT SOCIALISM IS

We have gotten to the point that such things as a billion-dollar increase in Government lending authority is no longer socialism in the minds of most of our people. You know better. Your resolutions show that you know better and you must, above all, continue to meet, to discuss, and continue to tell America that our Government today is almost at the mercy of worldwide socialism. And that America, too, is Socialist in everything but name.

But you are prepared to see the Congress of the United States drop your resolutions to the bottom of a well.

You can be sure labor-dominated Congress will continue to press for more and more appropriations for public power projects, food subsidies, public housing, irrigation, credits, and loans. Additional burdens will be laid on every taxpayer—now and for generations to come.

We must all begin to fight in the same manner that the labor leaders fight to extend their control over our great Nation.

Dean Manion, an old and cherished friend of mine, calls my attention to a quotation from the Book of Proverbs:

"Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

What is the landmark? What must we do if we had the votes?

We can restore the Constitution, and reassert its provisions so that even the Supreme Court of the United States cannot misinterpret it.

We can limit the power of Congress to tax, as it was limited until the 16th amendment.

We can take away—if the face of the Congress is changed—those things which the Federal Government is now doing which are immoral, unconstitutional, illegal, and outrageous.

We can once more set the free mind of America, the foundation, the creative, the atomic power of America, free America, further from the restrictions, the management of man over man, the compulsions, the propaganda, the deception, the unlimited, unconscionable power of government.

Almost 6 years ago Senator Taft and Candidate Eisenhower signed a manifesto of principles. This is what it says, in part:

"The greatest threat to liberty today is internal, from the constant growth of big government through the constantly increasing power and spending of the Federal Government. * * *"

God help us as we organize for the peaceful revolution to restore constitutional government in our land.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WATTS (at the request of Mr. PERKINS), for 10 days.

Mr. ALLEN of California, for May 22, 1958, on account of official business.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. YATES, for 45 minutes, today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow and Friday and Monday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CHIPERFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW and to include an address by the Secretary of State before the Atomic Power Institute in Durham, N. H., on May 2 sponsored by the Council of World Affairs notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be $182.25.

Mr. POAGE.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. DIXON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. DIXON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SANTANGELO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. MARSHALL) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6940. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired for developments under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7930. An act to correct certain inequities with respect to automatic step-increase anniversary dates and longevity step-increases of postal field service employees;

H. R. 8547. An act to authorize the disposal of certain uncompleted vessels; and

H. R. 11519. An act to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of newly developed weapons upon such vessels.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 728. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds;

S. 847. An act to amend the act of June 5, 1944, relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of Hungry Horse Dam, Mont.;

S. 2557. An act to amend the act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of certain compacts by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota in order to extend the time for such negotiation;

S. 2813. An act to provide for certain credits to the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association and the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District in consideration of the transfer to the Government of property in Phoenix, Ariz.;

S. 3087. An act to provide for the establishment of Fort Clatsop National Memorial in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; and

S. 3371. An act to amend the act of August 25, 1916, to increase the period for which concessionaire leases may be granted under that act from 20 years to 30 years.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6940. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands acquired for developments under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7930. An act to correct certain inequities with respect to automatic step-increase anniversary dates and longevity step-increases of postal field service employees;

H. R. 8547. An act to authorize the disposal of certain uncompleted vessels; and

H. R. 11519. An act to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of newly developed weapons upon such vessels.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 1958, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1936. A letter from the Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $10 million from the Development Loan Fund to the Industrial Development Bank (IDB) of Turkey has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1937. A letter from the Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $3,200,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Taiwan Railway Administration of the Government of the Republic of China has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1938. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $75 million from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of India has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1939. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $15 million from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of Israel has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1940. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $5,500,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of Pakistan has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1941. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $900,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of Ceylon has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1942. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $686,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Land Bank of Taiwan has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1943. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $1,600,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of Ceylon has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1944. A letter from the Deputy Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $750,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Government of Ceylon has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1945. A letter from the Manager, Development Loan Fund, relative to the establishment of a loan of not to exceed $2,500,000 from the Development Loan Fund to the Asia Cement Corp. of Taiwan has been authorized, pursuant to title II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1946. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of this Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration from January 1 through March 31, 1958, pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7564. A bill to provide that the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii shall meet annually, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of Conference. H. R. 10746. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1757). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCORMACK: Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. Report on the national space program pursuant to House Resolution 496 (85th Cong.) (Rept. No. 1758). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1759. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee of Conference. H. R. 5836. A bill to readjust postal rates

and to establish a Congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1760). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 12591. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1761). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 12591. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 12592. A bill to authorize an increased program of research in forestry and forest products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 12593. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed to the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, Utah, certain land of the United States which is not needed for the purpose for which acquired; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 12594. A bill to enable producers to provide a supply of turkeys adequate to meet the needs of consumers, to maintain orderly marketing conditions, and to promote and expand the consumption of turkeys and turkey products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H. R. 12595. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 12596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 12597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to assist small business by providing for a limited rapid amortization of expenditures made after December 31, 1957, and before January 1, 1961, for depreciable property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 12598. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for rapid amortization of depreciable property acquired by small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 12599. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10 percent increase in all monthly insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 12600. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 12601. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ an administrative assistant; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 12602. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 12603. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide for the release of source material reservations contained in conveyances of public and acquired lands, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 12604. A bill to enable American farmers to conduct their own programs; to establish production and marketing goals at prices fair to consumers and profitable to farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 12605. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 12606. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 12607. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1926, relating to the issuance and validity of passports, so as to authorize the Secretary of State to cooperate in the enforcement of certain laws relating to the travel of certain minors outside the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 12608. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 12609. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to permit the transfer of 1958 farm acreage allotments for cotton in the case of natural disasters and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 12610. A bill to extend for 2 years the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 12611. A bill to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 12612. A bill to authorize the withholding from the salaries of Government employees of amounts for health insurance premium payments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 12613. A bill to designate the lock and dam to be constructed on the Calumet River, Ill., as the "Thomas J. O'Brien lock and dam"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 12614. A bill to provide for a nationally uniform system of automobile registration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 12615. A bill to repeal or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 12616. A bill to create an independent Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military operations, and to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 12617. A bill to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, relating to the trust funds of the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 614. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Con. Res. 331. Concurrent resolution commending Shattuck School, of Faribault, Minn., on the occasion of its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. Res. 570. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on improving and strengthening the relationship, policies, and programs between the United States and Latin America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 571. Resolution adjusting the titles and salaries of certain positions in the office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 572. Resolution authorizing additional expenses for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 12618. A bill for the relief of Leland Li-Chung Chou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 12619. A bill for the relief of Ikram Yusuf Dughman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 12620. A bill for the relief of American Hydrotherm Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H. R. 12621. A bill for the relief of Sooren Alexander Skender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 12622. A bill for the relief of Dr. Miklos Kornel Berenkey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 12623. A bill for the relief of Adela A. Nones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 12624. A bill for the relief of Palmer-Bee Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 12625. A bill for the relief of Stavroula Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 12626. A bill for the relief of David Chu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H. R. 12627. A bill for the relief of Konstantina G. Gianibas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

635. By the SPEAKER: Petition of R. P. McGarity and others, Benton Harbor, Mich., requesting passage of House bills 1008, 4523, 4677, and 5974, pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

636. Also, petition of the county clerk, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., relative to endorsing the stand of the executive committee of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, and urging the enactment of legislation that will prohibit and make illegal the distribution through the United States mail of all obscene literature and pictures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland Before American Feed Growers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 21, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I delivered at the American Feed Growers Association conference luncheon in Chicago, Ill., on May 20, 1958.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND DELIVERED AT THE AMERICAN FEED GROWERS ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE LUNCHEON, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 20, 1958

This is not the year for men of little faith to dominate our thinking or our actions.

It was only a few short months ago that men of little faith were prepared to accept the false notion that the godless men in the Kremlin had an economic, a political and a military ascendancy over the United States because they had sputnik and mutnik in the air and we had none.

In November of last year I stated in my home State of California:

"This is no time for either defeatism or complacency. It is no time to sell America short."

In the intervening months our Nation has successfully put into orbit Explorer I, Vanguard II, and Explorer III.

It is, of course, always dangerous to underestimate the opposition. It can also be fatal to overestimate it.

We must not take our constitutional form of government or our free enterprise system for granted.

Neither fall into the category of something that can be locked in a safe deposit box and kept forever secure. Each generation must be prepared to make the necessary sacrifices to maintain them that our Founding Fathers were prepared to make in the first instance.

Other nations have been or now are larger in land area, in population and in natural resources. Yet they have not been able to give to their people the freedom and the standard of living Americans have enjoyed.

As important as is the productive capacity of our Nation and its military strength, these are not the factors which alone could preserve our freedom or enable us to maintain a Free World of free men. The inner strength of America has not been its great cities, its huge industrial plants, its extended transportation systems or its variety of natural resources as important as these are.

The factors which made America an inspiration to the rest of the world grew out of our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and the spiritual values which the founders of our Republic recognized and by which they were guided.

We have recognized that there is a higher moral law to which governments are also accountable. We have humbly acknowledged the divine inspiration which has made and preserved us as a nation.

America is still the authentic revolution. The flame of freedom which was struck at Concord and Lexington still is an inspiration to the enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

But it is also an ageless lesson that no outsiders can win independence for a people. They must be willing to pay the price in blood and resources to gain their our freedom.

We do recognize, however, that when freedom is destroyed anywhere a bit of freedom is destroyed everywhere.

We have read of and been inspired by the action of George Washington in kneeling in prayer during the dark days of Valley Forge and of Lincoln seeking divine guidance during the dark days of the Civil War.

The priceless ingredient for our people has been our constitutional form of government which guarantees our religious, personal, and economic freedom.

In my judgment we do a disservice to the Nation and to ourselves when we lose sight of the fact that business profits, wage increases, and other benefits depend upon increases in productivity.

Our objective always should be to increase and put more of our productivity within the reach of more of our people. It should also be to leave sufficient incentive and resources, after taxes, for the people to exercise their freedom of choice in the market place.

Big government with confiscatory taxes can deprive them of that incentive.

Big industry and big labor with monopolistic power can also deprive them of that freedom of choice.

No group in industry or in labor has the right to strangle the economic life of 170 million Americans.

This is too much power for responsible men in business or labor to want, and is far too much for irresponsible ones to be allowed to have.

Our political freedom and bill of rights is closely related to our economic freedom. If one is destroyed the other will not long endure.

In no other political or economic system do the people have a greater freedom of choice.

The monopolistic power of business was checked by our antitrust statutes. That of the labor unions in recent years has been unrestrained. The power of the labor boss over the rank-and-file member has in many cases become tyrannical and unchecked.

The tragic and sordid revelations of the Senate's select committee, under the chairmanship of Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, with its uncontested evidence of widespread corruption, arrogance, and abuses in the operations of the unions investigated to date, have, in my judgment, not only shocked the working men and women who make up the membership of organized unions but also the American people throughout the Nation.

The American worker believes in our constitutional guaranties for our citizens. Why then does he tolerate the dictatorship and corruption in some of his unions.

The only reason, in my judgment, is because he does not have the tools to clean house.

How bad has corruption become? Let me quote from two well-known Americans. On Sunday, December 8, 1957, in New York, Francis Cardinal Spellman said:

"Daily we learn the sordid details of corruption and violence featured by newspaper, radio, and television. The close association of some union leaders with known criminals, the creation of dummy locals, the rigging of elections, extortion, acid throwing, graft, and the misuse of union funds—these blatant violations of the trust of their fellow workers make all of us who are friends of labor feel shame and indignation.

"But we must do more than be shocked or feel morally aggrevied. We must act, and, while there is still time, remove from power unscrupulous leaders and their underworld hirelings."

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN stated the situation as he found it in the following words:

"We have had ample evidence in our hearings of intimidation and victimizing of rank-and-file members by hoodlum control of some of the unions. The hearings have also revealed raids and plundering of union treasuries, violence against workers themselves, as well as instances of violence against management. The continuation of our work will, we are confident, result in legislation of benefit to the country and to the 17,385,000 working people in the United States who are members of unions."

The interim report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor-Management Field stated:

"As an overall finding from the testimony produced at our hearings, the committee has uncovered the shocking fact that union funds in excess of $10 million were either stolen, embezzled, or misused by union officials over a period of 15 years, for their own financial gain or the gain of their friends and associates."

I believe in and unqualifiedly support:

1. The right every American worker to join a union.

2. The right of collective bargaining.

These rights are now and will continue to be protected by law.

The right of every union member to have a free voice in the administration and activities of his or her union is a vital civil right of the first magnitude. If the union does not act in the best interests of the membership, the individual should be able to express his dissent without fear of coercion of retaliation.

I have introduced legislation in the Senate, and support similar legislation in California, which will guarantee democratic control by union members over the officers and